DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 393 876 TM 024 750

AUTHOR Alexander, Gary C., Comp.; And Others
TITLE Action Research: A Bibliography To Begin.
INSTITUTION Minnesota Univ., Minneapolis. Center for Applied Research and Educational Improvement.
PUB DATE Oct 95
NOTE 97p.
PUB TYPE Reference Materials - Bibliographies (131)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Action Research; *Cooperation; *Educational Change; Educational Research; *Evaluation Methods; Mentors; *Methods Research; Organizational Development; *Participatory Research; Political Influences; Research Methodology; Social Influences
IDENTIFIERS Dewey (John)

ABSTRACT

Action research, which, broadly defined, was one of the activities in which educators following in the footsteps of John Dewey engaged, emerged as a systematic approach for improving educational practice in the two decades following World War II. Action research then passed into relative obscurity. It has recently re-emerged in the educational literature and provides models for educational improvement. This bibliography, which is a work in progress, marks a place to begin reading about action research. Sources, some of which are annotated, are grouped into the following categories: (1) Early Writings: Before 1985 (37 references); (2) Origins and Concepts (56 references); (3) 1985 to 1990 (55 references); (4) How To: The Process of Action Research (34 references); (5) How To: The Products of Action Research (16 references); (6) Related Writings: Reflective Practice (45 references); (7) Collaborative Research (49); (8) Sociology/Political Theory (two refrences); (9) School Change (six references); (10) Program Evaluation (three references); (11) Supervision/Coaching/Mentoring (nine references); (12) Organizational Development (three references); (13) Curriculum Deliberation (Contains five references.) (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

TM

ED 393 876

Action Research: A Bibliography to Begin

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Compiled by

Gary C. Alexander

University of Idaho

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
GARY C. ALEXANDER

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Edited by

Jean A. King

Kyla L. Wahlstrom

University of Minnesota

Compiled for the Center for Applied Research and Educational Improvement

(CAREI)

College of Education

University of Minnesota

October 1995

TM024750

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Early Writings: Before 1985	Page 2
Origins and Concepts	Page 8
1985 to 1990	Page 32
How To: The Process of Action Research	Page 48
How To: The Products of Action Research	Page 55
Related Writings: Reflective Practice	Page 62
Collaborative Research	Page 70
Sociology/Political Theory	Page 86
School Change	Page 86
Program Evaluation	Page 87
Supervision/Coaching/Mentoring	Page 88
Organizational Development	Page 92
Curriculum Deliberation	Page 92

INTRODUCTION

The intuitive notion of action research--using information to evaluate and make decisions about how to improve practice--is probably as old as the act of teaching itself. Action research, broadly defined, was one of the activities in which many Progessive educators, following the problem-solving tenets of John Dewey, engaged. In the United States, it emerged as a systematic approach for improving educational practice in the two decades following World War II and then passed into relative obscurity, although practitioners in a number of settings continued their studies. The work of educators in the United Kingdom and Australia provided continuing models for the application of action research in the classrooms, and the recent, and indeed, triumphant re-emergence of action research in the educational literature is nothing short of astonishing. Since the mid-1980's, articles, chapters, and books discussing its rationale and methods have appeared on a regular basis, and a number of professional groups have taken on action research as a viable means of improving schools.

This project was undertaken with the hope of providing a useful bibliography for schools-and university based colleagues interested in understanding the action research process. The bibliography that appears on the following pages must be considered a work in process. It is, however, a place to begin.

Sincere thanks must be given to the following individuals: Jean A. King and Kyla L. Wahlstrom for their editorial support. Susan Noffke, Sharon Oja, and Iris Tiedt, whose helpful critiques of an earlier version of this bibliography greatly shaped its current form and content; and Nancy Marquette, who did the final word-processing of the document.

Gary C. Alexander
Jean A. King
Kyla J. Wahlstrom

EARLY WRITINGS: BEFORE 1985

Campbell, D. T. (1978). Qualitative knowing in action research. In M. Brenner, P. Marsh, & M. Brenner (Eds.). The social context of method. New York: St. Martin's.

Chein, I., Cook, S., & Harding, J. (1948, February). The field of action research. The American Psychologist,3,43-50.

Corey, S. M. (1950, February). Teachers as investigators. Progressive Education,27(4),131-132.

Corey, S. M. (1952, May). Educational research and the solution of practical problems. Educational Leadership,9(8), 478-484.

What is the relationship between the practical decisions made every day by school people and the more careful methodology dignified by the name, "research"? This question is analyzed by Stephen M. Corey. (Editor's comments)

Corey, S. M. (1953a). Action research to improve school practices. Columbia: New York Teachers' College.

Corey, S. M. (1953b, October). A perspective on educational research. Phi Delta Kappan,35(1), 21-24.

Corey, S. M. (1954a, January). Hoping? Or beginning to know! Childhood Education,30(5), 208-211.

Corey, S. M. (1954b, February). Action research and the classroom teacher. NEA Journal, 43(2), 79-80.

Corey, S. M. (1955). Implications of cooperative-action research for teacher education. In American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, Yearbook, (pp. 164-172).

Elliott, J., & Adelman, C. (1973). Supporting teacher research in the classroom. The New Era,54, 210-213,215.

Elliott, J., & Adelman, C. (1973). Reflecting where the action is: The design of the Ford Teaching Project. Education for Teaching,92, 8-20.

Elliott, J., & Adelman, C. (1976). Classroom action research. (Ford Teaching Project, Unit 2 Research Methods). Norwich, England: University of East Anglia, Centre for Applied Research in Education.

Elliott, J. (1976-77). Developing hypotheses about classrooms from teachers' practical constructs: An account of the Ford Teaching Project. Interchange,7(2), 2-20.

Elliott, J. (1978). What is action research in schools? Journal of Curriculum Studies,10(4), 355-357.

This short paper is an attempt to clarify "action-research" as distinct from more traditional concepts of educational research and its relationship to other modes of reflection on practice. A summary of what action-research means and a figure is included. (GCA)

Elliott, J. (1980). Implications of classroom research for professional development. In E. Hoyle & J. Megarry (Eds.), Professional development of teachers: Worldbook of education 1980 (pp. 308-324). London: Kogan Page.

The author argues that the process-product paradigm involves an acceptance of a radically different view of the nature of teaching and learning from the action research paradigm. These underlying assumptions imply different methodological approaches to the study of teaching and learning.

> Process-product methodology treats the teacher exclusively as an object of research and assumes his professional development to be a quite independent activity. By contrast, action research necessitates dialogue with the teacher and thereby involves him or her as a participant in the research process itself. Such involvement itself constitutes a mode of professional development. Therefore action research is not only a research process but also a process of teacher education.
>
> During the last decade the study of classroom events has become a major growth area for educational research. In this chapter, I shall not be reviewing specific research findings in order to discuss their relevance for teacher education. I shall contrast two distinct approaches to classroom research in terms of their underlying assumptions about the relationship between teaching and learning, and in the light of these assess their potential for influencing professional development. It will be my contention that not every way of influencing the practice of teachers in classrooms contributes to their professional development. Such development is an educational process, and in order to influence this process, classroom research must possess educative potential. (Abstract accompanying article)

Elliott, J. (1980b). Teacher participation in the development of practical theory. Unpublished Master of Philosophy thesis, University of London.

Elliott, J. (1983, January). Paradigms of educational research and theories of schooling. Paper presented at the Sociology of Education Conference, Birmingham, England. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 232 896)

> In the first part of the paper, the author discusses his observation that teachers perceive

any form of theorizing in schools to be intellectually dependent on educational researchers. Teachers assume that their access to educational theories depends on a group external to themselves and that theory has little practical value in the classroom. In the second part of the paper, the author discusses four existing research paradigms currently employed in the study of the process of schooling in society--functionalist, phenomenological, action-research, and social reproductionist. The functionalist model of systems analysis is attractive to many because it views social processes as self-regulating systems and appears to provide the foundation for a truly empirical-analytic science of society, free of value bias. In Alfred Schutz's phenomenological analysis model, social processes are viewed as the constructions of autonomous individuals. Habermas' educational action-research model is based on the assumption that social processes rely on the existence of subjectively shared rules of interpretation for translating social norms and values. Social reproductionist theory attempts to show that subjective meanings expressed in social action are biased by their economic function. The action-research model best supports educational research as a science aimed at improving schooling, thus maximizing the theoretician practitioner relationship. (Abstract accompanying article)

Hodgkinson, H. (1957, December). Action research: A critique. The Journal of Educational Sociology,31(4), 137-153.

Horace Mann-Lincoln Study Group. (1948, November). Recommended: Group research for teachers. Teachers College Record,50(2), 108-113.

Lasky, L. R. (1978). Personalizing teaching: Action research in action. Young Children,33(3), 58-64.

Lewin, G., & Lewin, K. (1942, October). Democracy and the school. Understanding the Child,10(1), 7-11.

Lewin, K. (1938, July). Experiments on autocratic and democratic principles. The Social Frontier,4(37), 316-319.

Lewin, K. (1944, January). The dynamics of group action. Educational Leadership. 195-200.

This article discusses the impact of experiments in group and leadership problems and how they provide insight into the essential aspects of democratic living. (GCA)

Lewin, K. (1946). Action research and minority problems. Journal of Social Issues,2(4), 34-36. In S. Kemmis & R. McTaggart (Eds.), The action research reader (3rd ed.) (pp. 41-46). Geelong, Victoria: Deakin University Press, 1988.

Lewin, K. (1947). Channels of group life: Social planning and action research. Human Relations,1, 143-153.

Lewin, K., & Grabbe, P. (1945, August). Conduct, knowledge, and acceptance of new values. Journal of Social Issues,1(3), 53-64.

Oliver, B. (1980). Action research for in-service training. Educational Leadership,37, 394-395.

Shumsky, A. (1956). Cooperation in action research: A rationale. Journal of Educational Sociology,30, 180-185.

Shumsky, A. (1958). The action research way of learning: An approach to inservice education. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.

Stenhouse, L. (1975). An introduction to curriculum research and development. London: Heinemann.

Stenhouse, L. (1978). Using research means doing research. Norwich: Centre for Applied Research in Education, University of East Anglia. (mimeo; prepared for Festschrift to Johannes Sandven).

Stenhouse, L. (1979). The problem of standards in illuminative research. Scottish Educational Review, 11(1), 7. (In L. Bartlett et al. (Eds.), Perspectives on case study 2: The quasi-historical approach. Geelong, Victoria: Deakin University Press.

Stenhouse, L. (Ed.). (1980). Curriculum research and development in action. London: Heinemann.

Stenhouse, L. (1981). What counts as research. British Journal of Educational Studies, 29(2).

Stenhouse examines the concept of research, what it is, who does it, and what it implies, especially for the classroom teacher. (GCA)

Stenhouse, L. (1983). Authority, education and emancipation. London: Heinemann.

Taba, H. (1957). Problem identification. In Research for curriculum improvement (pp. 42-71). Washington, D. C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Taba, H., & Noel, E. (1957). Action research: A case study. Washington, D. C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (NEA).

ORIGINS AND CONCEPTS

Argyris, C., Putnam, R., & Smith, D. (1987). Action science: Concepts, methods, and skills for research and intervention. New York: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Argyris, C., & Schon, D. (1989). Participatory action research and action science compared: A commentary. American Behavioral Scientist,32(5), 612-623.

Berthoff, A. E. (1981). The teacher as researcher. In The making of meaning. Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook Publishers, Inc.

> Berthoff suggests that teachers in dialogue with one another can find directions for excellence as they work out their own theory. This does not mean generating new data, but, instead, reconsidering the data that is at hand. (Author)

Bolster, A. S. (1987). Toward a more effective model of research on teaching. In Teachers, teaching, and teacher education. M. Okazawa-Rey, (Ed.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard College.

Cameron-Jones, M. (1983, December). A researching profession? The growth of classroom action research. Paper presented at the Seminar on Pedagogy, Focus on Teaching Project, Moray House College of Education, Glasgow, Scotland. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 266 138)

> In education, action research is research carried out by practitioners with a view to improving their professional practice and understanding it better. This paper concentrates particularly upon classroom action research by in-service teachers, although

the approach can also be embodied in pre-service training courses and can embrace a very wide range of professional practice outside the classroom. Classroom action research is now seen as a major means of professional development, particularly within innovative in-service courses and programs and, as such, it is attracting growing support and interest. As this approach becomes more widespread, the notion of teacher-as-researcher becomes better developed and more fully understood. This paper outlines the origins of the approach, describes its characteristic features, gives examples, and presents two questions which it raises for Scotland: (1) how will this approach contribute to the development of in-service? (2) how will it contribute to the development of research? (Abstract accompanying article)

Cameron-Jones, M. (1985). Focus on teacher project. (Final Report). Edinburgh: Scottish Education Department. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 266 128)

Focus on primary teacher staff development. Its aim was to produce, from a platform of school-based research, materials to support improvement in primary classroom teaching. The focus was specifically on teaching, rather than on other aspects of a teachers' professional work. These materials were not to be directed merely at surface or even just technical improvements in teacher performance but were to go deeper and affect teachers' thinking about thinking; their actual conceptualization of teaching itself. Three year project (1983-85) (Abstract accompanying article)

Carr, W. (1985). Philosophy, values and educational science. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 17(2), 199-132.

In this article, Carr examines the concept that metaphysical and moral beliefs cannot be excluded from educational research. He gives the philosophical basis for reflective - action - research. He concludes by stating:

1) if I am correct in supposing values to be an inescapable category in educational research then, once again, the old positivist segregation of facts and values break down.

2) . . . since educational researchers cannot evade the task of deciding the educational values appropriate to their work, they cannot evade the responsibility for critically examining and justifying the educational values that their enquiries seek to foster and promote. . . . it follows that philosophical reflection and argumentation are central features of the methods and procedures of research.

3) . . . philosophy and values are not just a necessary but inconvenient feature of educational research; they are an indispensable requirement for the development of any genuinely educational science. (Abstract accompanying article)

Carr, W., & Kemmis, S. (1986). Becoming critical: Education, knowledge, and action research. Philadelphia: The Falmer Press.

This book offers a philosophical justification for the view that teachers have a special role as researchers and that the most plausible way to construe educational research is as a form of critical social science. One of the purposes of this book is to question the conformist view of education by questioning some of the beliefs on which it rests. (Authors' comments)

Cook, S. W. (1984, August). Action research: Its origins and early application. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association, Toronto, Canada. (ERIC Document

Reproduction Service No. ED 253 544)

> This paper contains informal remarks on action research in social psychology from its post World War II origins to its current status. Kurt Lewin first described action research in the 1946 article, "Action Research and Minority Problems," as a three-step process of program planning, program execution, and follow-up evaluation. Ronald Lippitt and Marion Radke also described 10 aspects of action research in 1946, based on programs to reduce anti-Semitism and racial prejudice by the Commission on Community Interrelations of the American Jewish Congress and the Institution of Ethnic Affairs. Participation in the research by the research subjects was the most important element. By 1948 four additional approaches to action research developed: diagnostic, participant, empirical and experimental. Questions and comments on the current status of action research have been raised by Nevitt Sanford, Leona Tyler, and Stuart Oskamp. What happened to action research--whether it died, moved into other disciplines, or reemerged with new names like program evaluation or social policy research--remains unanswered. (Abstract accompanying article)

Ebbutt, D. (1985). Educational action research: Some general concerns and specific quibbles. In R. G. Burgess (Ed.), Issues in educational research: Qualitative methods. (pp. 152-174). Philadelphia, PA: The Falmer Press.

Elliott, J. (1985). Educational action-research. In Research, policy and practice. World Yearbook of Education (pp. 231-250). New York: Nichols Publishing Company. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 256 004)

> This paper explores the relationship between a

process model of curriculum design and the view of the theory-practice relationship embodied in the idea of educational action-research. It concludes with an exploration of the problem of establishing an appropriate form of organization for action-research in educational institutions. This paper covers four major themes:

1) the nature of educative action and its relationship to educational knowledge;
2) the development of teachers' professional knowledge through action-research;
3) educational research and educative practice; and
4) the institutionalization of action-research in schools.

In developing each theme the author draws together a variety of relevant theoretical work, and illustrates his exposition with examples of action-research projects with which he has been personally involved. (Abstract accompanying article)

Florio, S., & Walsh, M. (1980). The teacher as a colleague in classroom research. In H. Trueba, G. Guthrie & K. Au. (Eds.). Culture in the bilingual classroom: Studies in classroom ethnography. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Florio-Ruane, S., & Dohanich, J. B. (1984). Research currents: Communicating the findings: Teacher/researcher deliberations. Language Arts, 65(2), 182-191.

Griffin, G. A. (1983). Interactive research and development on schooling: Antecedents, purposes, and significance for school improvement. Austin: Texas University, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, Education Annex. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 234 024)

This paper introduces the antecedents and concepts underlying a two-year investigation of Interactive Research & Development of Schooling (IR&DS). IR&DS is an alternative means of conducting school-based research & development and is seen as a means to: (1) involve school personnel in systematic inquiry; (2) improve the utility of research findings for the improvement of educational practice; (3) reduce the time lag between knowledge generation and knowledge utilization; (4) strengthen local education agency capability to act upon school problems; (5) coordinate school improvement activities between higher education agencies and local education agencies; (6) generate knowledge about schooling practices; and (7) provide professional growth opportunities to participants in the process. The paper is organized into six sections. First, an overview of IR&DS is presented. This is followed by a delineation of the purposes of the implementation of the strategy. Antecedents to IR&DS are presented with particular attention given to the first test of the model in the late 1970's. The differences between that test and the present study are discussed. Last, the relation between IR&DS and school improvement and staff development is advanced as a preliminary proposition based upon findings from the present study. (Abstract accompanying article)

Huling, L. L. (1982, March). The effects on teachers of participation in an interactive research and development project. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, NY. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 220 450)

This paper describes an interactive research and development project that has been successful in training teachers to use research findings and practices in their teaching. Classroom teachers were organized into interactive research and

development teams along with staff developers and university researchers. Each team conducted a field-based research project. Also reported are the results of an investigation of certain types of changes teachers made as a result of participating in this program. Participating teachers demonstrated a significant change in concerns about the use of research findings and practices in teaching and a significant increase in research teaching development skills. (Abstract accompanying article)

Kelly, A. (1985). Action research: What is it and what can it do? In R. G. Burgess (Ed.), Issues in educational research: Qualitative methods (pp. 129-151. Philadlephia, PA: The Falmer Press.

Kemmis, S. (1980, November). Action research in retrospect and prospect. Paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the Australian Association for Research in Education, Sydney.

Kemmis, S. (1982). The socially critical school. Paper presented at the annual conference of the Australian Association for Research in Education, Brisbane, Australia.

Kemmis, S., et al. (1983). The action research reader. Geelong, Victoria: Deakin University Press.

Krathwohl, D. (1974). An analysis of the perceived ineffectiveness of educational research and some recommendations. Educational Psychologist,11(2), 73-86.

While not the usual type of presidential address, this paper follows a conviction that began with a similar presidential address to the American Educational Research Association, that it is more important to use this occasion to consider critical problems confronting the profession than to report

personal research. Because of the leadership role that educational psychologists have traditionally played, the consideration of these problems, which affect the entire educational field, seemed particularly appropriate. (Abstract accompanying article)

Lagemann, E. (1989, Summer). The plural worlds of educational research. History of Education Quarterly, 29(2), 184-214.

Lytle, S., & Cochran-Smith, M. (1989, April). Teacher research: Toward clarifying the concept. The Quarterly,11(2), 1-27.

Limiting the official knowledge base for teaching to what academics have chosen to study and write about disenfranchises teachers and relegates their knowledge to the status of practical information or common sense. This contributes to a number of problems: discontinuity between what is taught in universities and what occurs in classrooms; teachers' ambivalence about or disregard for the claims of academic research which often seems counter-intuitive or unconnected to the daily demands of their work lives; and, because teachers are seldom recognized as potential contributors to the making of knowledge, a dearth of codified information about the reality of classroom life from the perspectives of insiders. Unfortunately teacher research, which by definition has unique potential to address issues that teachers identify as significant, does not yet have an acknowledged place in constructing the knowledge base for teaching. (Author)

Martin, D. W. (1985, April). Applied vs. basic research: On maintaining your balance with a foot in each camp. Presidential address presented at the Annual Meeting of the Rocky Mountain Psychological Association, Tucson, AZ. (ERIC Document Reproduction

Service No. ED 261 064)

The paper discusses a number of issues concerning the practical usefulness of cognitive psychology research, and presents a case study of pilot training methods to illustrate a model of research processes that produces outcomes which contribute to both basic and applied research goals. research studies are described as varying in the degree to which they include reviews of the literature, present practical conclusions, select and manipulate variables based on convenience or bias, or add to the existing body of knowledge. The following research strategy is recommended: identify application set; determine common dimensions; create complex generic laboratory task to test the theoretical hypothesis; perform experiment; form theoretical conclusion; validate conclusion and task; and list applications. This strategy is illustrated in detail with a case study. The case study describes flight training of aircraft pilots, with emphasis on their attention to multiple visual stimuli. (Abstract accompanying article)

May, N. (1982, Summer). The teacher as researcher movement in Britain. In W. H. Schubert & A. L. Schubert (Eds.). Conceptions of curriculum knowledge: Focus on students and teachers (pp. 23-30). Pennsylvania: PA State University, College of Education.

McCutcheon, G. & Jung, B. (1990). Alternative perspectives on action research. Theory into Practice,29(3), 144-151.

McKernan, J. (1988, Spring). The countenance of curriculum action research: Traditional, collaborative, and emancipatory critical conceptions. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision,3(3), 173-200.

The action-research movement offers practitioners a research stance toward their work and is now enjoying a resurgence of interest as practitioners continue to expand their notion of what counts as good curriculum research. This paper has three objectives: to examine and explore the evolution of action research as a scientific enterprise; to discuss the countenance, or character, of contemporary curriculum action research by disclosing and focusing on the key concepts that give substance to the idiom of such inquiry; and finally, to present a practical model of the action-research process. (Abstract accompanying article)

McKernan, J. (1988, Spring). Teacher as researcher: Paradigm and praxis. Contemporary Education,59(3), 154-158.

Mohr, M. (1980, Winter). The teacher as researcher. Virginia English Bulletin, 61-64.

Murray, D. (1982). Learning by teaching. Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook.

Donald Murray's collected articles on teaching and writing are listed here because he discusses so many issues of interest for classroom research on writing. His book contains articles on assignments, conferencing, revising, editing, grading and even the politics of writing. Selections from this book are very useful depending on the particular aspect a teacher researcher focuses on in his or her study. However, the central article in the book, "Write Research to be Read," is so important for teacher-researchers to read, I cannot imagine a group not reading and discussing it. We read it just as we began to write up our rough drafts of our studies. It helped each writer establish a clear sense of her own voice. Because teacher research is intended

primarily for an audience of teachers, this issue of establishing an authoritative and honest voice is crucial. If other teachers do not believe the voice of the researcher, they will discount the study. (Abstract accompanying article)

Nixon, J. (1987). Only connect: Thoughts on stylistic interchange within the research community. British Educational Research Journal,13(2), 191-202.

This paper seeks to discuss current issues in teacher research in terms of two distinct but related research fields: action research and case study. Both share a common aspiration: the former attempts to shift educational research closer to the concerns of practitioners by redefining their role as active participants in the research process; the later tries to exert a similar influence by taking as its object of enquiry the bounded system within which practitioners operate.

In spite of their commonality of purpose, however, action research and case study highlight different kinds of issues and problems. Each has its own gurus and guinea-pigs, its own journals and agendas, its own distinct crop of methodological literature. In this literature, action research has been presented as participatory, developmental and self-evaluative, while case study is seen as placing the emphasis on procedural principles that are democratic, heuristic and interpretive. Throughout the following analysis the attempt is not to equate teacher research exclusively with one or other of these orientations, but rather, by tracing continuities across methodological boundaries, to locate it as a vital element in current thinking about applied educational research. (Author's comments)

Noffke, S. (1989). The social context of action research: A comparative and historical analysis. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 308 756)

Noffke, S. (1990). Action research and the work of teachers. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, MA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 320 871)

This paper outlines the assumptions about the work and working conditions of teachers evident in various practices of action research in education. First, a thorough analysis of documents from the period of action research in the post-World War II era in the United States is presented. Images of the work and workplace of teaching from this period begin to establish patterns to be pursued in looking at later work. The second section begins with an examination of the writings of Lawrence Stenhouse whose thoughts on the teacher-as-researcher have been influential in the development of action research, especially in the United Kingdom and Australia. The section concludes with a discussion of projects conducted in Australia, the United Kingdom, and the United States in the late 1970s and early 1980s. Finally, issues in action research related to the work and workplace of teachers are identified, and their implications for current action research practices are discussed. (Abstract accompanying article)

Oja, S. N., & Pine, G. J. (1983). A two year study of teachers' stages of development in relation to collaborative action research in schools. Final report [and] appendices to final report. Washington, D. C.: National Institute of Education, New Hampshire

University, Durham, Dept. of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 248 227)

Action research conducted by teams of university professors and middle school teachers investigated the relationship between teachers' developmental stages, collaborative research, and individual teacher change. Section 1 describes the study's purposes and objectives and the methods used in analyzing teachers' stages of development. An overview of the study is presented in section 2. Section 3 discusses developmental stage and life/age theories of adult development, organizational change, and school context and the value and method of collaborative action research. Section 4 describes characteristics of the participating teachers, the study methodology, and the two middle school sites; school contexts and the history of school change. Section 5 describes the research topics undertaken by the two research teams. Section 6 presents findings of one team's research process and group process. Findings on the organizational and school context, as they related to the work of the collaborative research teams, are presented in section 7. Section 8 includes teachers' developmental test scores and their perceptions regarding issues in the collaborative action research process. The final section summarizes conclusions from the findings and considers implications for collaborative action research and staff development. The appendices contain: (1) a review of the literature on collaborative action research; (2) descriptions of research instrumentation; (3) discussions on action research and group process analysis and a case study of one research team; (4) reports from two research teams taking part in the study; and (5) descriptive summary reports on the teachers, researchers, and institutional settings involved in the study. (Abstract accompanying article)

Oja, S. N. (1984, April). Developmental stage characteristics of teachers participating in a collaborative action research project. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 246 038)

An investigation was made of the relationships among teachers' stages of development; their perceptions of school and classroom problems; and their reasons for participating in a collaborative action research project. On the basis of observations, logs, interviews, and introductory questionnaire data, life age/cycle profiles of each of 10 middle and junior high school teachers were constructed. Each teacher completed questionnaires to describe character-related personality stages of development. Three test instruments were used to determine teachers' levels of moral reasoning, ego maturity, conceptual complexity, and interpersonal sensitivity. The teachers' stages of development were then related to their perceptions of the change process and the process of collaboration during the constructed. The data suggested themes on the relationships of individual dimensions of teachers' stages of development, issues in the teaching-schooling profession, and the process of collaborative research. (Abstract accompanying article)

Oja, S. N. (1984a, April). Role issues in practical collaborative research on change in schools. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 247 249)

This paper addresses one major question: What unique perspectives and skills does the university researcher, in interaction with the teacher/practitioner, contribute to help a collaborative research/evaluation team identify its

research and achieve its goal? Case analysis of a recently completed National Institute of Education Project (Action Research on Change in Schools) has generated several possible responses to this major question. These responses include how the university researcher: contributes to an effective and efficient group process; establishes a norm of support for risk-taking and role-changing; and broadens individual perspectives by probing the practitioners' experience bases. Other sub-questions explored in similar fashion include: What responsibility does the researcher have to the reality and practicality of the research to be undertaken? What responsibility does the researcher have to limit the team's research to that which has generalizable results, and to identify and/or ignore side issues which are introduced? (Abstract accompanying article)

Oja, S. N. (1990). Developmental theories and the professional development of teachers. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, MA.

Oja, S. N., & Ham, M. C. (1984, Fall). A cognitive developmental approach to collaborative action research with teachers. Teachers College Record,86(1), 171-192.

Collaborative action research is one strategy that provides opportunities for translating concepts for educational reform into practice. The research project on which this article is based sought to describe how teachers in groups functioning at different developmental stages viewed issues in collaborative action research. (In introduction to article)

Peters, M., & Robinson, V. (1984). The origins and status of action research. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science,20(2), 113-124.

Phillips, D. (1980, December). What do the researcher and the practitioner have to offer each other? Educational Researcher, 9(11), 17-20 and 24.

Pine, G. J. (1984, April). School context, new contexts and school change. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 250 372)

> Action Research on Change in Schools (ARCS) was a two-year collaborative action research project involving two groups of middle/junior high school teachers, one in Michigan and one in New Hampshire. While the purpose of the project for the university researchers was to examine individual change within the framework of collaborative action research, the pervasive concern of the teachers throughout the project was school change. Based on these goals, the ARCS teams evolved into "temporary systems," defined as groups of individuals who engage in a joint task for a limited period of time. Peer support, the sharing of ideas, the experience of collegiality and group decision making, were especially prized by the ARCS teachers. The teams created their own operational contexts based on an atmosphere of collegiality and inquiry. By the end of the project, collaborative action research process become the school's context for decision making and initiating change. (Abstract accompanying article.)

Rich, S. (1983, October). On becoming teacher experts: Teacher-researchers. Language Arts, 60(7), 892-894.

Ross, D. D. (1983, April). Action research in a university laboratory school: An interview study. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada.

(ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 230 613)

> Fifteen teachers who have conducted group or individual action research projects were interviewed to identify factors which promote and, at times, limit teachers' efforts to conduct action research studies. Interviews which ranged from 45-90 minutes focused on teachers' definitions of research, their involvement in research projects, support they received and problems they encountered in research projects, and their awareness of the projects of others. Drawing on teachers' observations and recommendations, nine recommendations are made to school policy makers who wish to encourage teachers to conduct action research studies: (1) help teachers develop a realistic definition of research; (2) encourage participation in research projects, but keep participation voluntary; (3) provide time and money as incentives for conducting research; (4) provide systematic instruction to help teachers develop the skills necessary to conduct research; (5) provide access to appropriate resource personnel on a continuing basis; (6) develop a systematic way for teachers to share ideas with one another; (7) recruit only highly motivated teachers; (8) involve the teachers from the initial moment of decision-making; and (9) make several people responsible for the coordination of the project. (Abstract accompanying article)

Ross, D. D. (1984, Winter). A practical model for conducting action research in public school settings: Focus on research. Contemporary Education, 55(2), 113-117.

> Many educators today are discussing the value of action research but, as yet, action research is not occurring in many public school classrooms. Teachers and administrators interested in fostering action research need strategies for eliciting

school system support and for encouraging teacher participation. This article presents a practical model for making increased participation a realistic possibility. The ideas are based on current literature and on comments made by teachers who recently have been engaged in action research projects. (Abstract accompanying article)

Rudduck, J. (1985). Teacher research and research-based teacher education. Journal of Education for Teaching, 11(3), 281-289.

This paper argues for redrawing the relationship between research, teaching, and teacher education. The notion of research as conducted by practicing teachers and its possible contribution to the common store of education knowledge needs to be examined and clarified. Teacher research sustains professional curiosity and focuses professional dialogue. (Author)

Rudduck, J. (1989). Critical thinking and practitioner research: Have they a place in initial teacher training? Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 310 109)

Schubert, W. H., & Schubert, A. L. (1984, April). Sources of a theory of action research in progressive education. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 243 925)

The paper defines action research and what conception of theory might best contribute to its development. Action research is a continuous conscious attempt to seek increased meaning and direction in a teacher's relationship with students. Practical inquiry of teachers with their

students is a form of educational research. A Masters Degree Program in Instructional Leadership in which students pursue an internship instead of a formal thesis is described. The internship involves students in proposing and implementing a change in their own teaching situation. A review of curriculum research examines Dewey's practical inquiry approach and the more formalized experimental studies promoted by Thorndike, Cattell, and others. Action research theory is summarized in several points, among them that action research is a spirit of inquiry that strives for meaning and direction in the educative action of teachers, learners, and those who help them. (Abstract accompanying article)

Simmons, J. M. (1984, December). Action research as a means of professionalizing staff development for classroom teachers and school staffs. Paper presented at the Development Council, Williamsburg, VA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 275 639)

This paper focuses on critically analyzing both the potential and problems of practitioner Action Research as a means of genuine professional development for classroom teachers today. Action Research is a process of systematic inquiry and of knowledge, skill, and attitude growth in which classroom teachers on either an individual or collaborative basis investigate a self-identified instructional problem and attempt to better understand and improve the teaching/learning process occurring in their classrooms. This paper's critical analysis involves a review of the issues surrounding teaching as an emerging profession, what is known about effective staff development practices, and what is emphasized in the literature on school workplace conditions in which teachers function on a day-to-day basis. Finally, the paper reviews the potential as well as various serious dilemmas inherent in the use of

action research as a staff development experience. The nature of such dilemmas are discussed in terms of certain cautions which should be noted regarding practitioner action research at this time. A seven page list of references concludes the document. (Abstract accompanying article)

Simmons, J. M. (1985, March-April). Exploring the relationship between research and practice: The impact of assuming the role of action researcher in one's own classroom. Paper presented at the 69th Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 266 110)

A study examined the impact of assuming the role of action researcher in one's own classroom as an example of inquiry-oriented, professional staff development. The study was a part of a comprehensive, longitudinal investigation of the impact of certain professional development experiences on K-12 classroom teachers. A review of the literature and interviews and questionnaire research project sought to determine: 1) ways that teachers were influenced by reflectively analyzing their own practices in light of research regarding the teaching-learning process; 2) the impact of the teacher's attitudes toward doing research, reading research, and using investigating teacher experiences and beliefs regarding the relationship of educational research and their classroom practices. The teachers felt that there have been positive increases in their knowledge and skills in the following areas: 1) effective teaching-learning; 2) research; 3) reflective thinking habits; 4) the need for continuing professional development; and 5) overall effectiveness as teachers. (Abstract accompanying article)

Simmons, J. M., & Sparks, G. (1985). Using research to develop professional knowledge and

teaching. Journal of Staff Development, 6(1), 106-116.

Describes the use of action research to help teachers meet their own improvement needs. (Abstract accompanying article)

Smulyan, L. (1983, April). Action research on change in schools: A collaborative project. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 235 192)

Action research, a term first used in the 1940's by Kurt Lewin, implies the application of tools and methods of social science to immediate, practical problems, with the goals of contributing to theory and knowledge in the field of education and improving practice in the schools. Collaborative action research suggests that each group represented in the process shares in the planning, implementation, and analysis of the research; and that each contributes different expertise and a unique perspective to the process. Problems in conducting collaborative action research include initiating a collaborative project between school and university; addressing the concerns of all participants; and participating in the processes of collaboration which occur between the project's inception and the production of its results. The Action Research on Change in Schools project proposes to examine the relationships among teachers' developmental stages, action research in schools, and individual teacher change. (Abstract accompanying article)

Smulyan, L. (1984, April). Collaborative action research: Historical trends. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 254 949)

This paper presents a historical overview of the use of action research in education and describes the basic assumptions and expectations that continue to characterize collaborative research projects today. Action research was initiated in the 1930's by Kurt Lewin and adapted by educators in the 1940's. Interest in action research declined between 1953 and 1957, and during the 1960's and early 1970's action research became inquiry done by practitioners with the help of a consultant. In the mid-1970's, new and expanded views of action research began to appear, leading to a revival that has continued into the 1980's. In recent studies, the method itself has become a topic of inquiry. Certain common expectations about the process of collaborative action research can be identified and grouped into the following three categories: (1) participation in the research process--teacher and researcher roles; (2) staff (practitioner) development--expectations and outcomes; and (3) conditions or requirements necessary for successful collaborative action research. Some of the problems involved in carrying out a collaborative action research project are also discussed. A 38-item reference list is provided. (Abstract accompanying article)

Stones, E. (1986). Towards a systemic approach to research in teaching: The place of investigative pedagogy. British Educational Research Journal,12(2), 167-181.

Perhaps if teachers were genuinely involved in research that touched on their own concerns, research might gradually become less prone to follow fashion as well as becoming less dependent upon short term funds. There are many in the teaching force who would be willing to engage in research activity as things are at present. However, one of the things that need addressing by teachers and the research community, is increasing

the opportunity for such research activities. . . . This is a matter that needs the attention of teacher organizations as well as research associations such as BERA [British Educational Research Association]. I discuss this matter and approaches to increasing teacher involvement later in the paper. (Author's comments)

Tikunoff, W., & Mergendoller, J. (1983). Inquiry as a means to professional growth: The teacher as researcher. Staff Development, 82nd yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press), 210-227.

The development of research skills as a form of professional growth for educators is the topic of this paper. The discussion proceeds in three parts. First, the nature of research is defined. Then a research and development strategy that engages teachers in the conduct of inquiry is described. We call this strategy Interactive Research and Development (IR&D). Finally, three variations of Interactive Research and Development process are discussed. Our concern throughout is with developing an understanding of how engagement in the conduct of research provides rich, valuable professional growth experiences for teachers. (Author's comments)

Wallace, M. (1987). A historical review of action research: Some implications for the education of teachers in their managerial role. Journal of Education for Teaching,13(2), 97-115.

It has been questioned whether action research and management perspectives may be reconciled in developing a strategy for supporting teachers in improving their contribution to the management of educational institutions. The debate is seen to rest upon the conception of action research and management employed. By tracing the history of

action research a range of conceptions is portrayed and key differences are analyzed. In order for a conception of action research to be articulated as an approach to educational management it is suggested that teacher educators, teachers and head-teachers should clarify their position in respect of five fundamental issues raised by the review and analysis: the values inherent in the enterprise; the rights and responsibilities of those involved; the nature of learning to perform managerial tasks; the relationship between theory and practice; the achievement of rigor; and the provision of support for action researchers. (Abstract accompanying article)

Whyte, W. (1989). Introduction. American Behavioral Scientist, 32(5), 502-512.

This article defines participatory action research, looks at the history of organizational behavior, and views current research (GCA).

Williamson, P. A., & Taylor, J. B. (1983, Fall). Action research: From the ivory tower to the firing line. Education,104(1), 93-95.

The authors examine current strategies which teachers employ to solve classroom concerns and point out various shortcomings. A form of action research is then described which the authors have employed with in-service teachers. Specific suggestions are made concerning the use of action research by superintendents, principals, and teachers. (Abstract accompanying article.)

1985 TO 1990

Adelman, C. (1989). The practical ethic takes priority over methodology. In W. Carr (Ed.), Quality in teaching: Arguments for a reflective profession (pp. 173-182). London: The Falmer Press.

Amarel, M. (1987). Research currents: The classroom collective: We, them, or it? Language Arts, 64, 532-539.

Barritt, L., Bleeker, H., Beekman, T., & Mulderij, K. (1985). Researching Educational Practice. Grand Forks, ND: North Dakota Study Group on Evaluation.

Bissex, G. L. (1988). On learning and not learning from teaching. Language Arts,65(8), 771-775.

Bracy, G. (1989, July). Why so much education research is irrelevant, imitative and ignored. The American School Board Journal,176(7), 20-22, 42.

Part of the problem with education research is slavish imitation of psychological research, itself a pale imitation of research in the physical sciences. More central, though, are fundamental flaws in how research should be conducted, coupled with a pernicious reward structure at the universities. (Author's comments.)

Burton, F. R. (1986, November). Research currents: A teacher's conception of the action research process. Language Arts,63, 718-723.

Frederick Burton brings together the concepts of action and reflection. In his own puzzling about his students, he illustrates that substance for thought need not only come from outside the classroom; our daily actions as teachers provide

much "content for reflection," and that reflection in turn enriches our actions. As Burton notes, the bringing together of action and reflection defines the essence of the currently popular but elusive concept of "teacher-research." Thus, as the column itself demonstrates, information coming from outside the classroom and that coming from inside the classroom can enrich each other. (Editor's comments.)

Carr, W. (1989, Jan./Feb.). Action research: Ten years on. Journal of Curriculum Studies,21(1), 85-90.

This article is a review of Action Research in Classrooms and Schools, D. Hustler, A. Cassidy and E. C. Cuff (Eds.), Allen and Unwin, London (1986, 220 pages; and Action Research and the Nature of Social Inquiry: Professional Innovation and Education Work, by Winter, et al. (1987), 167 pages.

The author discusses the present status of action-research as a legitimate methodology and its relationship to the theory of positivism, its precursor. The author contends that an adequate analysis of this relationship has not been made and therefore, the relationship is still ambiguous and confused. (Article's Abstract)

Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. L. (1990a). Research on teaching and teacher research: The issues that divide. Educational Researcher,19(2), 2-11.

Neither interpretive nor process-product classroom research has foregrounded the teacher's role in the generation of knowledge about teaching. What is missing from the knowledge base for teaching, therefore, are the voices of the teachers themselves, the questions teachers ask, the ways teachers use writing and intentional talk in their work lives, and the interpretive frames teachers

use to understand and improve their own classroom practices. Limiting the official knowledge base for teaching to what academics have chosen to study and write about has contributed to a number of problems, including discontinuity between what is taught in universities and what is taught in classrooms, teachers' ambivalence about the claims of academic research, and a general lack of information about classroom life from a truly emic perspective. This article proposes that teacher research has the potential to provide this perspective; however, several critical issues divide teacher research from research on teaching and make it difficult for the university-based community to acknowledge its potential. The article also proposes that in order to encourage teacher research, the educational community will need to address incentives for teachers, the creation and maintenance of supportive networks, the reform of organizational patterns in schools, and the hierarchical power relationships that characterize much of schooling. (Abstract accompanying article)

Cochran-Smith, M. (1990b). Reinventing student teaching. Journal of Teacher Education,42(2), 104-118.

Cochran-Smith, M. (in press). Learning to teach against the grain. Harvard Educational Review.

Comber, B. (1988). The continuing conversation: Choices in educational research. Language Arts,65(8), 776-787.

Comfort, L. (1985). Action research: A model for organizational learning. Journal of Policy Analysis and Management,5(1), 100-118.

Cooper, L. (1990). Teachers as researches: Attitudes, opinions and perceptions. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational

Research Association, Boston, MA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 322 130)

Teacher researchers may be the essential link between the philosophy and training of higher education and the grass roots implementation at the public school level. The Teacher-Researcher (T-R) Institute has the potential of providing a catalyst for role change and a channel for research in action. This paper describes the merits and defaults of the Baltimore County (Maryland) T-R program from the classroom teacher's point of view. It also shows the perceptions of a group from the Maryland Writing Project. Teacher-researchers attend a 1-week workshop at the T-R Institute to prepare manuscripts describing classroom investigations for publication in education journals. To determine the impact of the T-R Institute on professional growth, a 10-item questionnaire requiring handwritten responses was developed and distributed. A follow-up evaluation was conducted via telephone interviews. An instrument developed from the outcomes of the two surveys was designed to measure attitudes toward the program. Responses to the questionnaire are discussed and briefly analyzed. The findings indicated similar positive attitudes and opinions both from the T-R participants and the more diverse Maryland Writing Project. (Abstract accompanying article)

Daiker, D. A., & Morenberg, M. (Eds.). (1990). The writing teacher as researcher. Heinemann.

Dyson, A. H., & Genishi, C. (1988). Paradoxes in classroom research. Language Arts, 65(8), 788-798.

Elliott, J. (1987, September). Knowledge, power and teacher appraisal. Paper presented to the British Educational Research Association Annual Conference, Manchester, England. (ERIC Document Reproduction

Service No. ED 292 860)

> The relationship between teacher appraisal and educational research in the United Kingdom is illustrated by the personal and professional experiences of an educator. An autobiographical analysis of this relationship, in light of M. Foucault's analysis of this relationship between power and knowledge, is presented. A clear relationship between teacher training and application of that training in the classroom is lacking. A similar lack of relevance characterizes school curricula in relation to student experience. Avoiding an over-disciplinary stance by the teacher, and preventing a loss of teacher authority over students are best achieved by action-research based curriculum development. Participation in the approach developed by L. Stenhouse, through the Schools Council/Nuffield Humanities Project (SCNHP), increased the level of action-research based development. The position of teacher appraisal within the system is a part of a much broader strategy for transforming power relations in the educational system. In the SCNHP, the transition was made from developing school curriculum to developing teacher curriculum, and from a first-order action research to a second-order action research. The current situation, based on an agreement between the government, employers, and teachers' associations, is critiqued. (Abstract accompanying article)

Elliott, J. (1989). Knowledge, power and teacher appraisal. In W. Carr (Ed.), Quality in teaching: Arguments for a reflective profession (pp. 201-219). London: The Falmer Press.

Elliott, J. (1989a). Academic and action-research: The training workshop as an exercise in ideological deconstruction. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research

Association, San Francisco, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 307 715)

Elliott, W. (1988). The primacy of experience and the politics of method. Educational Researcher,17(5), 15-20.

Evans, C. L., et al. (1987). Educational practitioners: Absent voices in the building of educational theory. Washington, D. C.: Wellesley College, MA Center for Research on Women. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 294 861)

A discussion is presented on the lack of fit between educational research and educational practice. It is pointed out that traditional research is likely to be particularly inaccessible to female practitioners who may feel more alienated by and excluded from the world of research than their male colleagues. Teachers need to participate actively in research in a way which is individually meaningful and which enhances rather than interferes with their primary activity, classroom teaching. A description is given of the work of the Educators' Forum, a seminar designed to stimulate and support practitioner research. The Forum encourages teachers to participate in practitioner research, through which they learn to take seriously and articulate what they know and to discover ways to find out what they don't know. The seminar supports sustained professional dialogue based on the teachers' own knowledge of their educational practice. The research agenda consists of their own individual concerns. This effective participation in educational research is demonstrated by case studies reported by three elementary teachers who conducted research in their classrooms. (Abstract accompanying article)

Freedman, S. W., et al. (1987). Response to

student writing. NCTE Research Report 23. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Noting that while writing teachers acknowledge that responding to their students' writing is central to their teaching, they still express frustration about how to make their response effective. This book describes a two-part study conducted to discover how the nation's most successful writing teachers respond to their students' work. (Abstract accompanying article)

Glickman, C. (1990). Action research: The school as the center of inquiry. In Supervision of instruction: A developmental approach (2nd, ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon. (pp. 358-370).

Chapter 18 examines action research as the integrating task for instructional improvement. Included are a brief history, examples of individual teachers and schools, and a procedure for making decisions about school-wide action research. (GCA).

Goldsberry, L. (1990). Is action research truly Research: The instructional leadership practicum. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, MA.

Goswami, D., & Stillman, P. R. (Eds.). (1987). Reclaiming the classroom: Teacher research as an agency for change. Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook. [P.O. Box 860, 52 Upper Montclair Plaza, Upper Montclair, NJ 07043]. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 277 022)

This book addresses the how's and why's of action research although it is not a step-by-step how-to book. It is a collection of essays written by theorist-practitioners and actual classroom teacher-researchers who share their experiences and

insights. (GCA)

Ham, M. C., & Oja, S. N. (1987, February). A collaborative approach to leadership in supervision. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Arlington, VA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 277 696)

This project demonstrates a collaborative process designed to address the continuing preparation of principals who have primary responsibility for supervising and evaluating teachers, and their preparation of cooperating teachers as more effective supervisors of student teachers. The project focuses on one major question: What is the role of collaborative action research in providing public school principals and teachers with support and challenge for both individual and organizational development and improved supervisory practice? The project includes three phases over a 3-year period: (1) five elementary and two middle staff members facilitated the formation of Collaborative Teacher Supervision Groups); (2) both principals and teachers are applying cognitive-developmental theory to current supervisory practices; and (3) the Principal Leadership Group and the Teacher Supervision Groups will match supervisee developmental stages with appropriate modes of supervision and will disseminate their findings. The long-range value of this inquiry is three-fold: (1) to generate implications and further questions for the design and implementation of more effective supervision strategies; (2) to enhance teacher effectiveness and student learning through improved supervisory practices; and (3) to contribute to the development of a theoretical base for the practice of instructional supervision. (Abstract accompanying article)

Kincheloe, J. (1991). Teachers as researchers:

Qualitative inquiry as a path to empowerment. New York, NY: The Falmer Press.

According to Kincheloe, the best way for teachers to gain the ability to counter school bureaucracies is to empower themselves through the knowledge of qualitative research and inquiry. (GCA)

King, B. (1990). Creating curriculum together: Teachers, students, and collaborative investigation. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, MA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 322 111)

_____(1988, July/August). Learning from children: Teachers do research. Harvard Education Letter,4(4).

Standing at the all-important intersection of theory and practice, teachers are in a position to formulate research questions that are critical to educational improvement. What teachers learn from their inquiries can be applied immediately to their own daily practice and, at the same time, also constitutes a source of important knowledge for the field of education. (Author)

Livingston, C., & Castle, S. (Eds.). (1989). Teachers and research in action. National Education Association.

Loucks-Horsley, S., et al. (1987). "Teacher as researcher" in Continuing to Learn: A Guidebook for Teacher Development. (pp. 46-53). The Regional Laboratory for Educational Improvement of the Northeast and Islands.

Lytle, S. & Cochran-Smith, M. (1990, Fall). Learning from teacher research: A working typology. Teachers College Record,92(1), 1-103.

Mayher, J. (1991). New lenses for old problems: What we believe is what we see. In R. Brause, & J. Mayher (Eds.), Search and re-search: What the inquiring teacher needs to know (pp. 3-22). New York, NY: The Falmer Press.

Mayher, J., & Brause, R. (1991). The never-ending cycle of teacher growth. In R. Brause, & J. Mayher (Eds.), Search and re-search: What the inquiring teacher needs to know (pp. 23-42). New York, NY: The Falmer Press.

McConaghy, T. (1987, April). Teachers as researchers: Learning through teaching. Phi Delta Kappan,68(8), 630-631.

McConaghy talks about classroom research as learning by doing and how the process will enhance and keep teaching alive and exciting. (GCA)

McCutcheon, G. & Oberg, A. (1989). Teachers' experience doing action research. Peabody Journal of Education, 64(2), 116-127.

This article presents results of a survey of 10 teachers which was designed to explore teachers' experiences with action research. Concrete examples of what it's like to do action research are viewed as a valuable resource for teachers and for teacher educators who teach action research courses. (Abstract accompanying article)

Miller, D. M., & Pine, G. J. (1990). Advancing professional inquiry for educational improvement through action research. Journal of Staff Development,11(3), 56-61.

Mohr, M. (1988). Teachers as researchers: The opportunity to create a profession. Manuscript submitted for publication.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

This article describes different kinds of research that classroom teachers conduct and the various models for teacher-researcher work in university and local school settings. Also discussed are the opportunities that need to be available if teacher-researcher work is to grow and become a vital part of the K-12 teaching profession. (Abstract accompanying article)

Mohr, M., Grumbacher, J., Hauser, C., Mathews, G., & Willoughby, K. (1989, April). Teacher-researchers: Their voices, their continued stories. The Quarterly of the National Writing Project, 11(2), 4-7, 19.

Nixon, J. (1987, Winter). The teacher as researcher: Contradictions and continuities. Peabody Journal of Education,64(2), 20-32.

This article discusses the current issues facing teachers involved in research (GCA).

Noffke, S. E. (1990). Knower, knowing, and known in action research. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, MA.

Noffke, S. E., & Brennan, M. (1988, February). Action research and reflective student teaching at UW, Madison: Issues and examples. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, San Diego. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 292 793)

This paper outlines some of the issues that emerged from guiding student teachers through the experience of conducting action research. Action research was used as a way of working toward student teaching experience that would provide opportunities and structures to facilitate and enhance the students' development as reflective teachers. Several different approaches were used

in introducing action research to student teachers. To clarify their thinking, it was emphasized that the study was a means of obtaining and applying practical results to specific classroom situations. Students were also given some insight into data-gathering and observation as ways to develop their reflective teaching practices. In a discussion on how the student teachers were helped to reflect within their action research, a description is given of the "cosmic egg," a teaching tool developed to aid critical reflection by emphasizing the interrelatedness of all dimensions of an educational issue. The final section of this report considers issues that emerged from the experience of student teacher practice of action research. The appendices include a list of projects undertaken by the students, a diagram of the "cosmic egg," examples of action research reports written by student teachers, and a list of resources on using action research. (Abstract accompanying article)

Noffke, S. E., & Zeichner, K. M. (1987, April). Action research and teacher thinking: The first phase of the action research on action research project at the University of Wisconsin, Madison. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, D. C. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 295 939)

This report on action research projects conducted by student teachers as part of their pre-service teacher preparation program focuses on how action research improves the understanding of educational practices by the practitioner-researchers themselves. Two major topics are discussed. First, specific claims about the impact of action research on teachers' understandings are identified from selected projects conducted in the United States, the United Kingdom, and Australia. A description of the methodologies used to collect

supporting data is included. The second major topic of the paper is a description of the "Action Research on the Action Research" project under way at the University of Wisconsin, Madison. Action Research has been used in the University's elementary student teaching program for several years as one way to provide opportunities for growth in the ability to reflect systematically on one's own teaching practice. A comprehensive review of the literature on the impact action research can have on teacher thinking introduces the main body of the paper. (Abstract accompanying article)

O'Connor, B. (Ed.). (1990). Ask the experts. . . about action research versus formal research. Business Education Forum,44(4), 8-9.

This article iscusses whether action research has more potential in solving school policy problems than formal research. Determined that both types can and should be used in the educational decision-making process. (Abstract accompanying article)

Oja, S. N. (1987, October). Future prospects for collaborative models of teacher education: A collaborative approach to leadership in supervision. Paper presented at the Regional Holmes Group Fall Conference, Boston, MA. (For related document, see ED 292 754) (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 293 800)

The Collaborative supervision Project involving the University of New Hampshire and several public schools is described. This paper addresses the university teacher education interest in enhancing supervisory effectiveness and the teacher education faculty during the initial planning stages and the development, demonstration, and dissemination years of the project. A description is given of the

directive from the superintendent to the principals in the district to investigate different models of supervision resulted in two years of self-study of supervisory effectiveness. This led to the school district's interest in joining with the teacher education faculty to mutually develop a program which would address supervision issues. Successful practices are described and the way in which the project addresses some of the Holmes Group goals is summarized. (Abstract accompanying article)

Oja, S. N., & Pine, G. J. (1987a). Collaborative action research: Teachers' stages of development and school contexts. Peabody Journal of Education, 64(2), 96-115.

Oja, S. N. (1988). Teachers' ages and stages of development. In Holly, M. L. and McLoughlin, C. S. (Eds.). Perspectives on teacher professional development. Lewes, England: Falmer Press.

This chapter presents short in-depth descriptions of six different middle/junior high teachers and their participation on collaborative action research teams in their schools. The teachers represented different ages, career cycles, and stages of development. The reasons "why" teachers chose to become involved in collaborative action research often correlated with their life age and career cycles. On the other hand, "how" the teachers participated in the teams, and their goals, expectations, and outcomes often correlated with their developmental stage perspectives. (Author's comments)

Pine, G. J. (1986). Collaborative action research and staff development in middle school. Middle School Journal,18(1), 33-35.

Examples of action research projects addressing various topics: individualization, peer tutoring,

learning centers, learning modules, small group instruction, reading strategies, and classroom management. The outcomes of these studies led to concrete changes in classrooms and to teachers' reports of significant professional growth. (Abstract accompanying citation)

Shalaway, L. (1990). Learning to teach . . . not just for beginners. Scholastic, Inc.

Sockett, H. (1989). The challenge to action-research. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 307 691)

Strickland, D. S. (1988). The teacher as researcher: Toward the extended professional. Language Arts,65(8), 754-764.

Tripp, D. (1990). Socially critical action research. Theory into Practice, 29(3), 158-166.

This article contains ten articles which focus on the teacher as researcher.

Tway, E. (1988). The resource center: The teacher as researcher. Language Arts,65(8), 799-801.

Winter, R. (1989). Teacher appraisal and the development of professional knowledge. In W. Carr (Ed.), Quality in teaching: Arguments for a reflective profession (pp. 183-199). London: The Falmer Press.

Zitlow, C. S. (1987, April). Dimensions of faculty participation in a program designed to promote practice centered inquiry. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, D. C. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 282 854)

The Teaching Excellence Program, designed to promote faculty use of practice-centered inquiry, was conducted at a large research university (Ohio State). The program was based on a conceptualization of practice-centered inquiry that draws on action research, reflection-in-action, and action science ideas. Data collected throughout the program included tape recordings and field notes of faculty meetings, consultant notes on faculty activities, products generated by participants, organizational documents, and written evaluations of the program. A desire for collegial interchange on teaching was found to be a major aspect of the program. Participants were encouraged by an awareness that others cared about teaching in an environment where the reward system is not perceived as being supportive of teaching improvement. This paper provides an overview of the program, including a description of aims, format, and participants. The concerns expressed, topics explored, assistance and support needed, the evolving pattern of interactions, factors which supported or inhibited participation, and various effects of the program are summarized. (Abstract accompanying article)

HOW TO: THE PROCESS OF ACTION RESEARCH

Argyris, C., Putnam, R., & Smith, D. (1987). Action science: Concepts, methods, and skills for research and intervention. New York: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Asher, C. (1987). Developing a pedagogy for a teacher-researcher program. English Education,19(4), 211-219.

Based on the teacher-researcher program Carla Asher and colleague Nancy Wilson led at the Institute for Literacy Studies at Lehman College, this article describes seven principles that are essential to a functioning teacher-researcher program, often comparing them to similar essentials in the teaching of writing. (Abstract accompanying article)

Brause, R. (1991). Hypothesis generating studies in your classroom. In R. Brause & J. Mayher (Eds.), Search and re-search: What the inquiring teacher needs to know (pp. 181-206). New York, NY: The Falmer Press.

Brause, R., & Mayher, J. (1991a). Collecting and analyzing classroom data in theory and in practice. In R. Brause & J. Mayher (Eds.), Search and re-search: What the inquiring teacher needs to know (pp. 131-156). New York, NY: The Falmer Press.

Clift, R. J., & Houston, R. (Eds.). Encouraging reflective practice in education. (1990). New York: Teachers College Press.

What does it mean to think through teacher inquiry to the practical and improvement outcomes in schools in terms of student's learning and

development? This book includes differing perspectives on how to put theory and practice together and how to pair inquiry goals with a reality base and grounding in practice. (Author's comments)

Collins, J. (1991). Testing hypotheses in your classroom. In R. Brause & J. Mayher (Eds.), Search and re-search: What the inquiring teacher needs to know (pp. 157-180). New York, NY: The Falmer Press.

Dicker, M. (1990). Using action research to navigate an unfamiliar teaching assignment. Theory into Practice,29(3), 203-208.

Duckworth, E. (1987). The having of wonderful ideas and other essays on teaching and learning. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.

Ebbutt, D. (1982). Teachers as researchers: How four teachers coordinate action-research in their respective schools. Mimeo. Cambridge, England: Cambridge Institute of Education.

Gebhard, J. (1989). The teacher as investigator of classroom process: Procedures and benefits. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Teachers of English to Speakers of Other languages, San Antonio, TX. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 304 877)

Groarke, J, Ovens, P., & Hargreaves, M. (1986). Towards a more open classroom. In D. Hustler, A. Cassidy, & E. Cuff (Eds.), Action research in classrooms and schools (pp. 79-86). London: Allen & Unwin.

Haysom, J. (1985). Inquiring into the teaching process. Toronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

A book designed to be a stimulant to action and

reflection for teachers who are concerned to make a study of their own teaching. The book is divided into two parts; first, invitations to teachers to make a personal appraisal of their teaching through an analytical procedure which involves gathering information about four major aspects of teaching process: the teacher's frame of reference, the teacher's actions, the pupil's actions, and the pupil's covert experiences. The second part of the book contains invitations to teachers to implement and monitor changes which naturally follow from the self-appraisal. (Author's comments)

Hopkins, D. (1982, December). Doing research in your own classroom. Phi Delta Kappan, 64(4), 274-275.

Research can be a means of allowing teachers to engage in critical reflection upon their craft, says Mr. Hopkins. He demonstrates how teachers can use research to improve their own teaching. (Comments accompanying article)

Hopkins, D. (1985). Teacher's guide to classroom research. Great Britain: St. Edmund Bury Press.

This book helps teachers to look critically at their own classrooms primarily for the purpose of improving their teaching and the quality of life in their classrooms. (Author's comments)

Jaquez, C. (1989). Messages from teachers to researchers. In C. Livingston & S. Castle (Eds.). Teachers and research in action (pp. 84-89). Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Kemmis, S., & McTaggart, R. (1982). The action research planner (Rev.). Geelong, Victoria: Deakin University Press.

Manen, M. (1991). Researching lived experience: Human science for an action sensitive pedagogy.

Buffalo, NY: State University of New York Press.

Mayher, J., & Brause, R. (1991). Finding and framing questions. In R. Brause & J. Mayher (Eds.), Search and re-search: What the inquiring teacher needs to know (pp. 115-130). New York, NY: The Falmer Press.

Mayher, J., & Brause, R. (1991). Concluding and beginning. In R. Brause & J. Mayher (Eds.), Search and re-search: What the inquiring teacher needs to know (pp. 207-210). New York, NY: The Falmer Press.

McClure, R. (1989). Teachers using research: What does it mean? In C. Livingston & S. Castle (Eds.). Teachers and research in action (pp. 13-28). Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Mohr, M. M., & Maclean, M. S. (1987). Working together: A guide for teacher-researchers. National Council of Teachers of English.

Myers, M. (1985). The teacher-researcher: How to study writing in the classroom. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teaches of English/Educational Resources Information Center.

> This book was designed as a companion volume to A Procedure for Writing Assessment and Holistic Scoring (Myers, 1980). It is written for teachers looking for ways to analyze writing samples and to promote the idea of the teacher's being a researcher. (Abstract accompanying article)

Nations, J. (1989). Using research to solve student grouping problems. In C. Livingston & S. Castle (Eds.). Teachers and research in action (pp. 29-34). Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Nixon, J. (1981). A teachers' guide to action research. London: Grant McIntyre.

Oberg, A. (1990). Methods and meanings in action research: The action research journal. Theory into Practice,29(3), 214-221.

Olson, M. (Ed.). (1990). Opening the door to classroom research. Newark, Del.: International Reading Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 318 703)

This book presents the teacher as researcher from a variety of perspectives.

Sabine, C. D. (1983, October). An easy guide to action research for the school administrator. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association of School Business Officials, Phoenix, AZ. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 246 537)

Action research begins by identifying goals as perceived in the community; input is sought in neighborhood hearings or by running a series in the local newspaper and inviting response. Once a research group is organized, Action Research continues as a five-stage flexible study plan for practitioner improvement involving turning goals into researchable problems, breaking problems into their important parts, choosing fact-finding techniques, collecting and analyzing data, and presenting conclusions and recommendations. Stage 4, for example, entails recruiting volunteers for data collection on a geographical basis and classifying "raw data." That Action Research can be successful is shown in several examples, including one in which a Maryland fact finding project led to the problem-solving approaches. The guide includes a short bibliography and a five-page skeleton planning aid. (Abstract accompanying article)

Schaefer, P. (1989). Becoming researchers: Teaching mathematics to gray-area students. In C. Livingston & S. Castle (Eds.). Teachers and research in action. (pp. 35-54). Washington DC: National Education Association.

Schnesk, J. & Rackliffe, G. (1989). Faculty decision making: Sources of information. In C. Livingston & S. Castle (Eds.). Teachers and research in action. (pp. 69-83). Washington DC: National Education Association.

Shalaway, L. (1990) Tap into teacher research. Instructor,100(1), 34-38.

Examines the work of four teacher researchers and gives suggestions on how to be a better teacher researcher (GCA).

Sugarman, J. (1989). Practicing theory: Teachers using and creating knowledge. In C. Livingston & S. Castle (Eds.). Teachers and research in action. (pp. 97-102). Washington DC: National Education Association.

Sullivan, P. (Ed.). (1987). Teachers' research. Curriculum Publication,2. San Diego Area Writing Project.

This is a series of articles about successful practices used in the classroom by teachers seeking ways to make the practices even more successful. The teachers conducted research to determine how their classroom practices compared with the Model Curriculum Standards. The series serves also as a source of questions for teachers contemplating doing a research project. (Abstract accompanying article)

Thompson, C. (1989). Knowledge, power,

professionalism, and human agency. In C. Livingston & S. Castle (Eds.). Teachers and research in action. (pp. 90-96). Washington DC: National Education Association.

Ward, N. (1989). Developing collegiality around research. In C. Livingston & S. Castle (Eds.). Teachers and research in action. (pp. 55-68). Washington DC: National Education Association.

HOW TO: THE PRODUCTS OF ACTION RESEARCH

Bissex, G. L., & Bullock, R. H. (Eds.). (1987). Seeing for ourselves: Case-study research by teachers of writing. Heinemann.

Dicker, M. (1990). Using action research to navigate an unfamiliar teaching assignment. Theory into Practice,29(3), 185-195.

Glaze, B. (1987). A teacher speaks out about research. In J. Self (Ed.). Plain talk about writing and learning. Richmond, VA: Virginia Department of Education.

This book was published as a product of a state-wide effort to promote writing and learning. Bernadette Glaze's article describes how, as a teacher-researcher, she weaves together the existing research, her own research questions, and the interests and needs of her students to create a classroom where research is the focus. (Abstract accompanying article)

Golby, M. (1989). Teachers and their research. In W. Carr (Ed.), Quality in teaching: Arguments for a reflective profession (pp. 163-172). London: The Falmer Press.

Henry, J. (1985). A critical analysis of action research based in-service education: Four case studies. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Deakin University, Geelong, Victoria.

Hustler, D., Cassidy, A., & Cuff, T. (Eds.). (1986). Action research in classrooms and schools. London: Allen and Unwin.

This collection of essays is intended to provide examples of what practitioners are actually doing to examine, explicate, and improve their own practice. The intention is to demonstrate what action research is, from an involved rather than a purely theoretical stand point. All contributions in this book are grounded in examples of research; all are in a sense close to being case-studies. The second central purpose of this book is to provide a glimpse of the variety of possibilities and problems involved in collaboration between professionals working in differing sectors of the educational system. (Editor's comments)

King, B. (1990) Creating curriculum together: Teachers, students, and collaborative investigation. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, MA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 322 111)

According to the neo-Marxist critique, action researchers often neglect to take into account the historical, social, political, and cultural forces which silence students and protect the status quo in schools. One way to overcome this criticism is to link teacher research and emancipatory pedagogy, such as that advocated by Paulo Freire, in which both teachers and students collaboratively pose problems arising from real-life situations and, through questioning and reflection, pursue ways to solve the problems. Even if their actions are unsuccessful, students gain new knowledge and perspectives, and they learn to be critical in their thinking and actions. For example, a biology class raised questions about a toxic dump, located less than two miles from the school, which was not slated for local attention even though it was listed by the Environmental Protection Agency as hazardous and in need of immediate clean-up. Students generated questions and conducted research in which the interaction of

science, society, and political and ethical decision making became evident to them. Action, such as a case study that can be made available to others, indicates that students can generate their own curriculum and be motivated to learn in the process. Through such collaboration, change toward more democratic schools becomes more likely. (Abstract accompanying article)

Kleinfeld, J. (1988). Learning to think like a teacher: A study of cases. Unpublished paper, Center for Cross34-Cultural Studies, Rural College, University of Alaska, Fairbanks.

Kleinfeld's paper examines the rise of reflective practice or action research as it applies to the use of case studies and teacher preparation. The paper shows how case methods can be used to develop the particular professional way of thinking characteristic of expert teachers. (GCA)

Langston Hughes Intermediate School. (1987). Teacher research on student learning: A compilation of research studies focusing on minority and underachieving students conducted by the Langston Hughes school-based research group. Fairfax County, VA: Fairfax County Public Schools.

This teacher-researcher publication is a collection of articles from teachers of various disciplines (English, social studies, physical education, science) who conducted research on minority achievement in their classes and school. Also included are three studies about the teachers who conducted the research and a description of the process they went through. The book was distributed to the rest of the faculty at the school. Copies of it can be obtained from Hughes at 11401 Ridge Heights Road, Reston, Virginia 22091. (Abstract accompanying article)

Lawn, M. (1989). Being caught in schoolwork: The possibilities of research in teacher's work. In W. Carr (Ed.), Quality in teaching: Arguments for a reflective profession (pp. 147-161). London: The Falmer Press.

Morin, A. (1985, January). New trends for new needs in instructional technology theory and development. Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the Association for Educational Communications and Technology, Anaheim, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 256 327)

This report shares insights on varied experiences in action research at the university level and describes methods for involving subjects in research. Examples used include case histories of two projects: the Project de Recherche et d'Intervention a la Maison (PRIM), a research project on home intervention; and the Ford Teaching Project. Based on experiences in conducting a collective writing colloquium with popular educators in Quebec, seven principles are discussed which indicate that action research requires: (1) negotiation that leads to commitment; (2) an open contract; (3) a neutral quest for significance; (4) transcendence of the application of theory to practice; (5) valuing the experience of others; (6) diffusion of aggressive dialogue and argument activities; and (7) living with uncertainty and the knowledge that every situation is unique. Applications of a participatory action research approach are discussed, including its use as a strategy for collecting data and writing scripts or regional research proposals, and as a project evaluation model. Conclusions address the need to use action research to bridge the gap between practice and theory. A 15-item reference list is included. (Abstract accompanying article)

Oldroyd, D., & Tiller, T. (1987). Change from

within: An account of school-based collaborative action research in an English secondary school. Journal of Education for Teaching,13(1), 13-27.

> This paper argues that for change in schools to occur, the active collaboration of significant actors within each institution is essential. Attempts to introduce change are more likely to succeed if they: recognize the interdependence of individual actors and their institutional settings; are conducted in language accessible to the participants; start with the work-a-day experiences and perceptions of individual actors, both staff and pupils; address the "social" as well as the "material" realities and barriers within the institution's unique culture. In an English secondary school with a tradition of school-based in-service activities, a two-term collaboration between a Norwegian ethnographic researcher, the school's professional tutor, and a voluntary teacher action research group of staff, used a variety of approaches, to attempt to change classroom practice and perceptions about school "realities." The article describes how the collaboration evolved and the highly personal nature of change from within based on self-help. It presents an alternative to other attempts to bring about change, which are based on the withdrawal of actors from the setting which they are seeking to change. (Abstract accompanying article)

Olson M. (Ed.). (1990). Opening the door to classroom research. Newark, Del: International Reading Association.

> The idea of the teacher as researcher is presented from several different perspectives-- the teacher's, the administrator's, and the university based researcher's -- to convey a sense of what it means to be a teacher/researcher. The following

chapters are included: (1)the Teacher as Researcher-- A Historical Perspective (Mary W. Olson); (2) The Door is Open. Won't You Come In? (Faye Brownlie);(3) Learning to Research/Researching to Learn (Carol S. Avery);(4) Content Teachers as Researchers in Australia (Bert Morris, Patsy Bopf, and Nea Stewart-Dore);(5) Teaching as Research (Carol M. Santa);(6) Collaborating with Teachers on Research (Andrew C. Porter); (7) Preparing Principals for an Action Research Agenda in the Schools (John J. Beck);(8) Involving School administrators in Classroom Research (Floyd Sucher);(9)A Model of Teaching and Instructional Improvement (S. Jay Samuels and H. Lawrence Jones); and (10) Commentary--Teachers Are Researchers (Patrick Shannon). (Abstract accompanying article)

Parson, G. (Ed.). (1985). Hand in hand: The writing process and the microcomputer. Juneau, AK: Alaska Department of Education.

This book is the result of a collaborative research effort by ten Alaskan high school teachers to document what happened when they and their students began to use computers and writing process. Since all teacher-researchers in the project had a similar focus to their research, the finding are reliable beyond one classroom. Also included is self case study information from the teachers involved. (Abstract accompanying article)

Wood, P. (1988, April). Action research: A field perspective. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 295 938)

This paper presents the personal narrative of a teacher who engaged in action research in her classroom. A step-by-step description, outlined in

the prescribed form for conducting action research (plan, act, observe, and reflect), notes the successes and failures encountered throughout the experiment. A student teacher was conducting action research on a different topic simultaneously in the classroom. How collaborating on the two projects affected the cooperating teacher-student teacher relationship is described. A discussion is offered on the value of action research in the classroom, in pre-service teacher education and in-service educational programs for practicing teachers. (Abstract accompanying article)

Wotring, A., & Tierney, R. (1981). Two studies of writing in high school science. Berkeley, CA: Bay Area Writing Project.

Pioneers in conducting classroom research projects, Wotring and Tierney document what happened when they began to use writing in the context of science teaching. (Abstract accompanying article)

RELATED WRITINGS

REFLECTIVE PRACTICE

Anzul, M., & Ely, M. (1988). Hall of mirrors: The introduction of the reflective mode. Language Arts, 65(7), 675-687.

Armaline, W. & Hoover, R. (1989). Field experience as a vehicle for transformation: Ideology, education and reflective practice. Journal of Teacher Education, 40(2), 42-48.

Buckley, R. (1988). From questions to new questions: Reflections. Language Arts,65(7), 640-641.

Discusses the practioners' process of reflective practice (GCA).

Bullough, R., Jr. (1989). Teacher education and teacher reflectivity. Journal of Teacher Education, 40(2), 15-21.

This article examines the process of reflective program development (GCA).

Calderhead, J. (1989). Reflective teaching and teacher education. Teaching and Teacher Education, 5(1), 43-51.

This article examines the origins and nature of reflective teaching (GCA).

Canning, C. (1991, March). What teachers say about reflection. Educational Leadership,48(6), 18-21.

Cruickshank, D. (1985). Uses and benefits of reflective teaching. Phi Delta Kappan,66(10), 704-706.

Elabaz, F. (1988). Critical reflection on teaching: Insights from Freire. Journal of Education for Teaching,14(2), 171-181.

Evans, C. (1991, March). Support for teachers studying their own work. Educational Leadership, 48(6), 11-13.

Gideonse, H. (1990). Organizing schools to encourage teacher inquiry. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Explains how changes in school organization can be made to enhance teachers' ability to solve classroom problems, and can foster their ability to tailor classes to specific student needs. (GCA)

Gore, J. (1987). Reflecting on reflective teaching. Journal of Teacher Education,38(2), 33-39.

This article compares the methods of Cruickshank to those of Zeichner.

Grant, C. A., & Zeichner, K. M. (1984). On becoming a reflective teacher. In C. A. Grant Preparing for reflective teaching (pp. 1-18). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Grimmett, P., & Erickson, G. (1988). Reflection in teacher education. New York: Teachers College Press.

A discussion by several authors in Canada and the US on how Schon's ideas on the nature of reflection and the reflective practitioner can be integrated into teacher education, supervision, and teaching. Commentary, critiques, and dialogue from a variety of perspectives inform this discussion. (Author's comments)

Grimmett, P. (1989). A commentary on Schon's view of reflection. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision,5(1), 19-28.

Harris, I. (1989). A critique of Schon's views on teacher education: Contributions and issues. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision,5(1),13-18.

Harris examines Schon's work as it relates to the professional practice of teachers. (GCA)

Kennedy, M. (1989, Spring). Reflection and the problem of professional standards. Colloquy,2(2), 1-6.

Killion, J., & Todnem, G. (1991, March). A process for personal theory building. Educational Leadership, 48(6), 14-16.

Kremer, H. (1988). Reflection and professional knowledge--A conceptual framework. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 296 971)

LaBoskey, V. (1989). From studio to classroom-or not? Journal of Curriculum and Supervision,5(1) 29-34.

LaBoskey examines what are seen as several problems in Schon's reflective model. (GCA)

Liston, D. & Zeichner, K. (1987). Reflective teacher education and moral deliberation. Journal of Teacher Education,38(6), 2-8.

Meek, A. (1991, March). On thinking about teaching: A conversation with Eleanor Duckworth. Educational Leadership,48(6), 30-34.

Monson, R. & Pahl, M. (1991, March). Charting a new course with whole language. Educational Leadership,48(6), 51-53.

Noffke, S. & Brennan, M. (1988). The dimensions of reflection: A conceptual and contextual analysis. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 296 968)

O'Gorman, R. (1989). Knowing in action. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision,5(1), 10-12.

Osterman, K. (1990). Reflective practice: A new agenda for education. Education and Urban Society, 22(2), 133-152.

Reviews the concept of reflective practice within the framework of experiential learning theory. Discusses ways in which reflective practice advances professional practice for teachers and administrators. Explores the implications of these ideas for professional education and for school reform (Abstract Accompanying Article).

Pugh, W. C. (1987, April). Reflection in action as a principal's learning and decision-making tool. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, D. C. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 283 279)

This case study of a central office school improvement initiative in an urban system examines instructional leadership practices of two junior high school principals. The school-based research focuses on correlates of school effectiveness in "low achieving" settings and the principal's capacity to "reflect-in-action," an ability to make ongoing effective decisions about unpredictable problems and situations. Study findings suggest that development and practice of instructional leadership behaviors in low-achieving schools are associated with (1) the environment (school climate); (2) the principal's own past professional

experiences and staff development; (3) the issue of empowerment; and (4) the principal's capacity to reflect-in-action. The report presents a typology of principal's instructional leadership practices and an analysis of the researcher's role delineation. The study's primary implications are (1) school district's research offices can have a positive effect on improvement initiatives through the methodologies of action research and ethnology and (2) researcher's and practitioner's capacities to achieve positive educational outcomes are enhanced by the ability to reflect-in-action. researcher and principal can thereby become agents for change in improvement initiatives. The report concludes with two reference pages and an appendix identifying the typology and its ethnographic conceptual foundations. (Abstract accompanying article)

Ross, D. (1989). First steps in developing a reflective approach. Journal of Teacher Education, 40(2), 22-30.

This paper examines the introduction of reflective practice to preservice teachers (GCA).

Ross, W. & Hannay, L. (1986). Towards a critical theory of reflective inquiry. Journal of Teacher Education,37(4), 9-15.

Schon, D. A. (1983). The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action. New York: Basic Books.

This book examines what one might call the "underside" of professional practice, the intuitive "knowing" that exists within all of us and comes from accumulated knowledge and experience. Schon discusses this process through the use of a number of examples to show how professionals really go about solving problems. (GCA)

Schon, D. A. (1988). Educating the reflective practitioner. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

This book builds on the concepts of professional competence introduced in Schon's first book and offers a new approach to educating professionals. (GCA)

Schon, D. A. (1989). A symposium on Schon's concept of reflective practice: Critiques, commentaries, illustrations. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision,5(1), 6-9.

This article is a selection of quotations from Schon's books and speeches on reflective practice. (GCA)

Schon, D. A. (Ed.). (1991). The reflective turn: Case studies in and on educational practice. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Schulman, J., & Colbert, J. (1989). Cases as catalysts for cases: Inducing reflection in teacher education. Action in Teacher Education,11(1), 44-52.

Smyth, J. (1989). Developing and sustaining critical reflection in teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education,40(2), 2-14.

Smyth provides background information on the emergence of reflectivity as a conceptual thrust in teacher education. He also discusses some of the impediments to empowerment that teachers and teacher educators confront as they attempt to implement critical reflection in their curricula. Smyth concludes that if teachers (and teacher educators) are going to uncover the forces that inhibit and constrain them, they need to engage in four forms of action with respect to teaching. These "forms" are characterized by four sequential

stages and are linked to a series of questions: (a) describing (What do I do?), (b) informing (What does this mean?), (c) confronting (How did I come to be like this?), and (d) reconstructing (How might I do things differently?). (Abstract accompanying article)

Sparks-Langer, G. & Colton, A. (1991, March). Synthesis of research on teachers' reflective thinking. Educational Leadership,48(6), 37-44.

Stephens, D. & Reimer, K. (1990). Explorations in reflective practice. (Report No. 514). Urbana, IL: Illinois University, Center for the Study of Reading. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 324 692)

Surbeck, E., Han, E., & Moyer, J. (1991, March). Assessing reflective responses in journals. Educational Leadership,48(6), 25-27.

Sykes, G. (1989, Spring). Learning to teach with cases. Colloquy,2(2), 7-13.

Tama, M., & Peterson, K. (1991, March). Achieving reflectivity through literature. Educational Leadership,48(6), 22-24.

Veal, M., et al. (1988). School contexts that encourage reflection: Teacher's perceptions. Paper presented at the Florida Conference on Reflective Inquiry: Contexts and Assessments (Orlando, FL, October 20-22, 1988). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 307 269)

Waxman, H. (Ed.). (1988). Images of reflection in teacher education. Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 316 542)

Wellington, B. (1991, March). The promise of reflective practice. Educational Leadership,48(6),4-5.

Wibel, W. (1991, March). Reflection through writing. Educational Leadership,48(6), 45.

Wildman, T., & Niles, J. (1987). Reflective teachers: Tensions between abstractions and realities. Journal of Teacher Education,38(4), 25-31.

Zeichner, K. & Liston, D. (1987, February). Teaching student teachers to reflect. Harvard Educational Review,57(1), 23-48.

> Conventional teacher education programs follow an apprenticeship model and, in so doing, aspire to provide student teachers with pedagogical skills and techniques derived from a pre-existing body of knowledge. In this contribution to HER's special series, "Teachers, Teaching, and Teacher Education," Kenneth M. Zeichner and Daniel P. Liston argue that the conventional approach inhibits the self-directed growth of student teachers and thereby fails to promote their full professional development. Illustrating an alternative model, the authors describe and assess the elementary student teaching program at the University of Wisconsin, Madison-a program oriented toward the goals of reflective teaching, greater teacher autonomy, and increasing democratic participation in systems of educational governance. (Abstract accompanying article)

Zeichner, K. (1989, Spring). Kenneth Zeichner reflecting on reflection. Colloquy,2(2), 15-21.

COLLABORATIVE RESEARCH

Anderson, B. L., & Cox, P. L. (1988). Configuring the education system for a shared future: Collaborative vision, action, reflection. Andover, MA: The Regional Laboratory for Educational Improvement of the Northeast and Islands.

Anglin, L., & Mooradian, P. (1990). Colleges, universities and the urban school district: A collaboration dilemma! (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 316 630)

> This article reports the findings of a descriptive study of collaborative activities undertaken by postsecondary institutions in Cleveland (Ohio) with Cleveland Public Schools. The nature of the collaborative activities is described and recommendations for multi-interinstitutional cooperation leading to a common educational agenda are discussed. (Abstract Accompanying Article)

Berkeyh, R., et al. (1990). Collaborating for reflective practice: Voices of teachers, administrators, and researchers. Education and Urban Society,22(2), 204-232.

Discusses the work of six practioners, their process, and the impact of their reflection.

Canning, C. (1991, March). What teachers say about reflection. Educational Leadership,48(6), 18-21.

Clift, R., et al. (1990). Restructuring teacher education through collaborative action research. Journal of Teacher Education,41(2), 52-62.

This article describes a collaborative action research project between University of Huston

education faculty and the staff of five elementary schools. The project investigated the status of learning cultures for teachers and administrators in their schools. Implications for initial and continuing preparation of teachers and principals are drawn. (Abstract accompanying article)

Corrigan, D.,& Mobley, W. (1990). Educational reform agenda and partnerships. Paper presented at the Conference on School-University Partnerships. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 325 037)

Major factors contributing to the crisis in United States education are summarized, including poverty, changes in the American family, child abuse, changes in the ethnic composition of schools, increasing global competition, decline in traditional student performance measures, crisis in mathematics and science, shortages of teachers, shift in the make-up of the work force, the dropout situation, and intergenerational interdependence. The educational reform movement is discussed, both historically and with its current emphases on teacher empowerment, restructuring schools as centers of inquiry, allowing a 'bottom -up' strategy for change, and establishing accountability for results. Includes 41 references. (Abstract Accompanying Article)

De Bevoise, W. (1986, February). Collaboration: Some principles of bridgework. Educational Leadership, 43(5), 9-12.

De Bevoise supports the idea of collaboration between universities and schools, but underscores the fact that this collaboration is built on mutual need and mutual satisfaction, plus realistic expectations. (GCA)

Evans, C. (1991, March). Support for teachers studying their own work. Educational Leadership,48(6), 11-13.

Fergus, E., & Wilson, D. (1989). Advancing educational equity through social action research: A collaborative effort between universities and schools. Equity and Excellence,24(2), 38-45.

Friedman, M. (1990). Collaboratives--universities and schools as partners in staff development. Paper presented at the Eastern Educational Research Association Conference. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 318 715)

Some basic considerations undergird partnerships between schools and colleges undertaken to work on problems of mutual concern that may be difficult to solve individually. Studies have indicated that successful collaboratives require the existence of certain special conditions and the surmounting of certain barriers. Research studies have pointed to factors that facilitate and maintain collabortaion. Five major factors are considered important for collaborative development: (1) assessment of needs, (2) decision making, (3) willingness to reach out, (4) apperceptive base, and (5) flexibility. (Abstract Accompanying Article)

Goodlad, J. (1987a). Schools and universities can--and must--work together. Principal,67(1), 9-15.

Discusses the need for the development of school-university collaboration in the school reform movement. Describes three successful collaborative projects showing the positive effects gained from such collaborations. Includes a sidebar outlining the essentials for such partnerships and a list of references. (Abstract Accompanying Article)

Goodlad, J. (1987b). Linking schools and universities: Symbiotic partnerships. Occasional paper No. 1. Seattle, WA: Washington University Center for Educational Renewal. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 298 645)

This paper discusses an approach to educational improvement through collaboration between schools and universities. It develops the concept of symbiosis between unlike institutions in which each recognizes need for the other in seeking to fulfill its self-interest. The first section defines the essential characteristics of successful renewal: that workers at all levels must have optimal opportunities to combine their expertise, and that there must be a continuous infusion of both relevant knowledge and alternative ideas for practice stemming from inquiry into the enterprise. (Abstract Accompanying Article).

Harris, R., & Harris, M. (1990). Symbiosis on trial in educational renewal. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Northern Rocky Mountain Educational Research Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 325 482)

The collaboration of universities and schools/school districts has often been proposed as an effective force for reviewing the quality of the schools and the education of the educators. A study of a workshop that was a major collaborative event is an ongoing university-schools partnership illustrated that symbiotic and organic cooperation is functioning in the Brigham Young University-Public School Partnership, which was initiated in 1984. (Abstract Accompanying Article)

Hord, S. (1985). Collaboration or cooperation: Comparisons and contrasts, dilemmas and decisions. Paper presented at the Meadow Brook Symposium on Collaborative Action Research in Education. (ERIC

Document Reproduction Service No. ED 258 356)

This report discusses collaboration and cooperation in the field of education, describing them as distinctly different operational processes between either individuals or organizations, with each mode requiring different kinds of input and each yielding different sorts of returns. Based on these premises, the report attempts to briefly answer the following questions: How are collaboration and cooperation different? and What is the value of distinguishing between them? In the main section, the literature is explored on the topic of concepts and paradigms of individual, organizational, and interorganizational behavior. Also reviewed are the reports of agencies and institutions that 'cooperated,' 'coordinated,' 'collaborated,' or 'consorted.' Another section compares and contrasts collaboration and cooperation, using 10 catagories. A third section further refines these definitions into preliminary models for explicating the process of cooperation and collaboration. A 25-item reference list is provided. (Abstract accompanying article)

Hord, S. (1986, February). A synthesis of research on organizational collaboration. Educational Leadership,43(5), 22-26.

Hord discusses the differences between collaboration and cooperation. She explores the literature, examining the concepts and paradigms of individual, organizational, and inter-organization behavior to go in a scholarly perspective on individuals and groups working together. (GCA)

Hoyle, E. (1985). Educational research: Dissemination, participation, negotiation. Research, policy and practice. World Yearbook of Education (pp. 203-217). New York: Nichols Publishing Company. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 256 002)

Huling, L. & Johnson, W. (1983). A strategy for helping teachers integrate research into teaching. Teacher-Educator,19(2), 11-18.

Reasons why teachers do not use educational research are summarized, and an interactive research and development project aimed at overcoming utilization problems is described. In the project, teachers, staff developers, and Texas Tech University researchers worked collaboratively to study problems and concerns of classroom teachers. (Abstract Accompanying Article).

Intrilligator, B. (1986). Collaborating with the schools: A strategy for school improvement. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 277 089)

This paper posits guideline for planners forming interorganizaitonal arrangements--or collaboratives--among universities, businesses, community organizations, and schools. The paper hypothesizes that schools can benefit from collaboratives and that these partnerships' success is attendant upon mutual unerstanding of a collaborative focus. (Abstract Accompanying Article)

Jacullo-Noto, J. (1988, Summer). Partnerships that work: Involving teachers in their own development. New Directions for Continuing Education,38, 63-75.

The author discusses the collaborative partnerships that can be created between university faculty and school personnel by using action-research as a research and development model. The author feels that collaborative partnerships are the hope of the future. (GCA)

Killion, J., & Todnem, G. (1991, March). A process for personal theory building. Educational Leadership, 48(6), 14-16.

Kyle, D. W., & McCutcheon, G. (1984). Collaborative research: Development and Issues. Journal of Curriculum Studies,16(2), 173-179.

Traditionally, participants in educational research are separable into two groups: the researchers and the "researched." Recently, however, several educators have discussed benefits of these groups working together to study educational problems and, thus, advocate collaboration among researchers and practitioners (for example, Florio and Walsh). Indeed, the National Institute of Education's recent request for proposals reflects a belief in collaborative research in one of its criteria for the evaluation of proposals: "evidence that, where appropriate, there is collaboration between investigators and practitioners in defining research questions and conducting research."

Interest in collaboration, though, raises a number of questions. How did the approach develop? What methodological and ethical issues are related to this new relationship between researchers and practitioners? How might such an approach be useful? What sorts of roles can researchers and practitioners have in inquiry? The issues are not raised in order to frighten researchers from doing collaborative research, nor to be critical of it; rather, the issues are raised to permit their examination so researchers and teachers can pursue their work more conscious of the sorts of opportunities and difficulties they might encounter. (Abstract accompanying article)

Lieberman, A. (1986a, February). Collaborative work. Educational Leadership,43,(5), 4-8.

This article supports the idea that school and community leaders working together not only bring more resources to their problem-solving efforts but develop mutual trust and support that enhance professional development. (GCA)

Lieberman, A. (1986b, February). Collaborative research: Working with, not working on. . . . Educational Leadership,43(5), 28-32.

This article discusses the work of Ward and Tikunoff as it relates to collaborative research with teachers and principals. Lieberman discusses the results of a study done in both an urban and rural setting on interactive research. The benefits of teacher collaboration teams for research and development are discussed as well as the interactive process. (GCA)

Lucas, P. (1988). An approach to research based teacher education through collaborative inquiry. Journal of Education for Teaching,14(1), 55-73.

This paper argues that in order to encourage student teachers to engage in systematic reflection and nurture appropriate dispositions towards inquiry, we must act upon the implications of our knowledge of their vulnerable condition and of their perceptions of what is relevant. It is suggested what this might mean in practice, and the role of collaborative enquiry in the promotion of reflection is analyzed. There are three foci: the issue of student teachers approaching research; the relationship between professional collaboration in a small-scale "critical community" and the quality and form of reflection; and the dilemma of being honest and being sensitive in providing feedback, particularly where the role of student teacher vis-a-vis regular teacher is inverted. (Abstract accompanying article)

McDaniel, E. (1989). Collaboration for what? Sharpening the focus. Action in Teacher Education, 10(4), 1-8.

Mahon, P. (1991, March). The zen of teaching. Educational Leadership,48(6), 35-36.

Meek, A. (1991, March). On thinking about teaching: A conversation with Eleanor Duckworth. Educational Leadership,48(6), 30-34.

Miller, J. (1990). Creating spaces and finding voices: Teachers collaborating for empowerment. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

This book examines the collaborative efforts of five teachers and a university professor as they work through the problems of collaborative inquiry toward teacher empowerment. (GCA)

Oakes, J., Hare, S. E., & Sirotnik, K. A. (1986). Collaborative inquiry: A congenial paradigm in a cantankerous world. Teachers College Record,87, 545-561.

Oja, S. N. (1988). Program assessment report: A collaborative approach to leadership in supervision. Part B of the final report to the US department of education, Office of educational research and improvement. Durham, NH: University of New Hampshire Collaborative Research Projects.

Collaborative action research was used as a process in which elementary school principals, cooperating teachers, and university supervisors could investigate a common issue of importance, supervision of teaching interns in their schools. school and university participants met in collaborative supervisory teams to investigate theories of development and alternative models of

supervision. the goal was for participants to become more effective supervisors by learning to match appropriate supervision strategies to the cognitive-developmental needs and stages of the supervisees. In this program, the context of the collaborative action research supervisory teams supported and positively challenged teachers who wished to take on more supervisory responsibilities with interns. The Program Assessment describes outcomes and benefits for school teachers and principals, graduate teaching interns, school-university collaboration, and the university teacher education program, and includes poignant excerpts from the participants' own voices as they reflect on their experiences during this three year collaborative action research project. (See also the Project Portrayal and Practice Profile in Oja and Ham, 1988. - Author's comments)

Oja, S. N. (1988b, January). Some promising endeavors in school-university collaboration: Collaborative research and collaborative supervision in the University of New Hampshire five-year program. Paper presented at the Holmes Group Second Annual Conference, Washington, D. C. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 294 335)

Two areas of school-university collaboration in the University of New Hampshire five-year program of teacher education are collaborative research and collaborative supervision. This paper discusses how teachers, school administrators and university faculty work together as research and supervision issues in teacher education. In considering issues important in school-university collaborative research, the first one examined is the relationship between school content and the collaborative research being conducted. The second issue involves questions of project control and leadership. A description is given of two models of supervision that are being used. In one model, a

cooperating teacher assumes major responsibility for coordinating the teachers and interns within the school. Another school, using an egalitarian model, has all cooperating teachers meet regularly as a group with the university supervisor in order to address specific questions of intern supervision. Products of the project are briefly described, and intended outcomes are suggested. (Abstract accompanying article)

Oja, S. N., & Ham, M. C. (1988). Project Portrayal and Practice Profile. Part A and C of the final report of A Collaborative Approach to Leadership in Supervision project to the US department of education, Office of Educational research and improvement. Durham, NH: University of New Hampshire Collaborative Research Projects.

The Project Portrayal summarizes the evaluation of this collaborative action research approach to leadership in supervision project over its entire three years. This report makes summative analysis of major issues, strategies, and collaborative action research approaches and discusses implications for staff development, personal and organizational collaboration, and educational change. The Practice Profile includes project demographics, implementation requirements for collaborative action research approaches to supervision, and a checklist of essential program components, each with descriptors for ideal, acceptable, or unacceptable levels of implementation. (See also the Program Assessment Report in Oja, 1988 - Author's comments)

Oja, S. N., & Smulyan, L. (1989). Collaborative action research: A developmental approach. New York: The Falmer Press.

This book uses the Action Research on Change in Schools (ARCS) project as a case study for

analyzing key elements of effective collaborative action research. It focuses in particular on the collaborative processes which interact with, and influence, the research process and outcomes of an action research team, drawing on theory in the fields of group dynamics and adult development to explain how individuals and groups develop through their involvement in action research. (Comments by the authors)

Pine, G., & Keane, W. (1989). Collaboration for educational excellence and equity: Lessons learned. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Anaheim, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 304 437)

Porter, A. C. (1986). Collaborating with teachers on research: Pioneering efforts at the Institute for Research on Teaching (Occasional Paper No. 105). Washington, D. C.: Office of Educational Research and Improvement. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 283 794)

This paper reports on the characteristics of one specific form of collaborative research that was developed by the faculty from research institutions of higher education collaborating with teachers in K-12 schools on the conduct of research on teaching. Eighteen teachers have participated in this research with faculty from Michigan State University under the direction of the Institute for Research on Teaching (IRT). Typically, teachers teach in the morning and are with IRT in the afternoon. Research time is paid for by the IRT to the school district, including benefits. The contributions teachers make to a research program change and improve as they become familiar with research agendas and requirements. Teachers have defined research programs in the areas of: (1) classroom strategies; (2) integrating the teaching

of language arts into the teaching of other subjects; (3) the design of empirical investigations; (4) the staying power of changes in teaching practice; and (5) replication of work across many school settings. A description is given of how the teachers and faculty members work together and their perceptions of the benefits of the work. The costs of collaborative research, both institutional and personal, are also discussed. Brief descriptions are given of alternative forms of collaborative arrangements to illustrate the concepts, breadth and potential power. (Abstract accompanying article)

Reed, C., Mergendoller, J., & Horan, C. (1990). Collaborative research: A strategy for school improvement. Novato, CA: Beryl Buck Institute for Education.

Sagor, R. (1991, March). What project Learn reveals about collaborative action research. Educational Leadership,48(6), 6-10.

Sockett, H., & Endo, T. (1989). Collaboration in professionalism: The case of the Center for Applied Research & Development in Education (CARD). Presented at the American Educational Research Association.

SooHoo, S. (1989). Teacher researcher: Emerging change agent. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 307 255)

Sparks-Langer, G. & Colton, A. (1991, March). Synthesis of research on teachers' reflective thinking. Educational Leadership,48(6), 37-43.

Surbeck, E., Han, E., & Moyer, J. (1991, March). Assessing reflective responses in journals. Educational Leadership,48(6), 25-27.

Tama, M. & Peterson, K. (1991, March). Achieving reflectivity through literature. Educational Leadership,48(6), 22-24.

Torney-Purta, J. (1985, April). Linking faculties of education with classroom teachers through collaborative research. Journal of Educational Thought, 19(1), 71-77.

Trubowitz, S. (1986). Stages in the development of school-college collaboration. Educational Leadership, 43(5), 18-21.

The stages of development of the process of collaboration between Queens College, the New York City Board of Education, and Louis Armstrong Middle School, are presented in an effort to help universities and schools form partnerships.

Watkins, B. (1989). Schools and colleges seen failing to form close partnerships. Chronicle of Higher Education,35(27), A1,15.

Collaboration among and within universities, schools, teacher organizations, and public agencies are seen as the key to educational reform. The goal is the improvement of some aspect of teacher education, research, or schooling. (Abstract Accompying Article)

Ward, B. A., & Tikunoff, W. J. (1982, February). Collaborative research. Paper presented at the National Invitational Conference, "Research on Teaching: Implications for Practice," Warrenton, VA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 221 531)

Characteristics and contributions of collaborative research studies to educational practice are explored in this paper. Definitions of collaborative research are presented which note its

multiple roles and similarity to action research. Reasons for conducting collaborative research are given, centering around increased use of research outcomes facilitated investigation, and reduced time lapse before investigation. The strategy of involving all school practitioners in research is illustrated through four models: 1) interactive research and development (using teams of researchers and participants); 2) collaborative research within an entire school faculty; 3) collaborative research within an entire school district; and 4) university-based research with cooperating school personnel. Eight studies are summarized in which the collaborative research strategy was limited to teacher participants: 1) teachers' techniques with classroom disruptions; 2) effects of reducing class size; 3) process-centered teaching; 4) teachers' perceptions of effective bilingual instruction; 5) acquisition of writing literacy; 6) common issues of interest to a school faculty; 7) how children learn to read; and 8) writing instruction at the elementary level. Conclusion based on developments and outcomes of collaborative research in education are stated. An annotated bibliography of 18 studies is appended. (Abstract accompanying article)

Whitford, B., et al. (1989). Sustaining action research through collaboration: Inquiries for invention. Peabody Journal of Education,64(3),151-169.

Wibel, W. (1991, March). Reflection through writing. Educational Leadership,48(6), 45.

Wu, P. C. (1986). Research on collaboration: Why it works in some places and not in others. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council of States on Inservice Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 280 128)

This paper approaches the concept of collaboration

by using a workshop format in three segments: (1) a puzzle to solve, (2) lessons on collaboration learned from solving the puzzle, and (3) a tabular overview of the fundamental differences between universities and school districts which hinder collaboration. Included are 24 references. (Abstract accompanying article)

SOCIOLOGY/POLITICAL THEORY

Bernstein, R. J. (1976). The restructuring of social and political theory. London: Methuen University Paperback. (Part III).

Rapoport, R. (1985). Children, youth, and families: The action-research relationship. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

SCHOOL CHANGE

Atkin, M. (1989, November). Can educational research keep pace with education reform? Phi Delta Kappan, 71(3), 200-205.

> The progress of meaningful school reform will remain stalled until teachers emerge from their marginal positions in the research community and become full partners in the conception and the conduct of educational inquiry, Mr. Atkin maintains. (Editor's comments)

Fullan, M., Bennett, B., & Rolheiser-Bennett, C. (1989). Linking classroom and school improvement. Invited address at the American Educational Research Association.

> This article is organized into 4 main sections. In the first section, the authors identify the main features of why all major reform efforts have failed to date. Second, they describe a major reform effort they are engaged in called The Learning Consortium. Third, they present a comprehensive framework which is designed to help understand classroom and school improvement. Fourth, they formulate several important conceptual and policy implications for further developing the framework and its use. (GCA)

Fullan, M., Bennett, B., & Rolheiser-Bennett, C. (1990). Linking classroom and school improvement. Educational Leadership, 13-19.

Giroux, H. (1988). Teachers as transformative intellectuals. In H. Giroux (Ed.), Teachers as intellectuals (pp. 121-128). Massachusetts: Bergin & Garvey.

Livingston, C., & Castle, S. (1989). Teachers and research in Action. NEA school restructuring series. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 314 380)

O'Connor, B. (Ed.). (1990). Ask the experts. . . about action research versus formal research. Business Education Forum, 44(4), 8-9.

PROGRAM EVALUATION

Bickel, W. E., & Cooley, W. W. (1986). Decision-oriented educational research. Boston/Dordrecht/Lancaster: Kluwer-Nijhoff Publishing.

Price, R., & Politser, P. (Eds.). (1980). Evaluation and action in the social environment. New York: Academic Press.

Scriven, M. (1986). Evaluation as a paradigm for educational research. In House, E. R., (Ed.), New Directions in Educational Evaluation. London: The Falmer Press, pp. 53-67.

Scriven contends that researchers must change their vision of themselves "into service-researchers rather than pure-scientific-researchers." The need is to select and solve problems that really pay off for practitioners. (GCA)

SUPERVISION/COACHING/MENTORING

Coe, D. (1990). Toward collegial inquiry: Is there more to clinical supervision than the improvement of practice? Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, MA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 319 724)

> Written from the perspective of a participant, that is, the classroom teacher as novice supervisor, this paper presents, in case study form, a description of two cycles of clinical supervision involving teaching peers in an elementary school. The purposes of the paper are twofold. First, the paper explores, through illustrations from the case study, a number of themes germane to the doing of clinical supervision. Second, the paper demonstrates that there is more to clinical supervision than instrumental effectiveness. The improvement of practice, often espoused in the literature as the aim of any clinical supervision situation, becomes subordinate to unintended, yet ever developing and important outcomes, namely, a deeper mutual respect among participants and the enhanced self-understanding that is promoted by such a collaborative working relationship. Viewing clinical supervision as an instance of collaborative action research provides for the implications of collegial inquiry in a clinical supervision context to be more fully explored. (Abstract accompanying article)

Elliott, J. (1988, April). Teachers as researchers: Implications for supervision and teacher education. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 293 831)

> The opening section of this paper describes the author's first experience with collegial attempts

at curriculum reform through practical inquiry, illustrating a process in which ideas are tested and developed in action. It is pointed out that this form of teacher-based practical inquiry is a characteristic feature of a certain kind of curriculum reform process. It is stated that the institutionalization of "action-research" and "teachers as researchers" as approaches to teacher education within academic institutions raises a number of critical issues for tutors and supervisors to reflect about. If we are to facilitate reflective practice as a form of educational inquiry in schools then we must treat teacher education as a reflective practice also. "Some of the issues to be faced by teacher educators in promoting reflective practice and action research on the part of teachers are illustrated by detailed descriptions of three reform projects: (1) The humanities Curriculum Project, under the direction of Lawrence Stenhouse (1967); (2) The Ford Teaching Project (1973-75); and (3) The Teacher-Student Interaction and Quality of Learning Project (1981-83)." (Abstract accompanying article)

Elliott, J. (1989). Action-research and the emergence of teacher appraisal in the UK. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 309 522)

Elliott, J. (1990). Teachers as researchers: Implications for supervision and for teacher education. Teaching & Teacher Education, 6(1), 1-26.

This paper focuses on the problems, dilemmas and issues which confront facilitators of teacher-based action research in schools. The paper incorporates a biographical strand in which the author describes three action research projects he has been involved in as a facilitator during the last 15 years. In

doing so he attempts to show how each project addresses problems, dilemmas and issues for facilitators which were unresolved in previous ones. He attempts to illustrate the development of his understanding of the facilitator's role over time. The paper also attempts to clarify the theoretical and philosophical assumptions which underpin the action research movement in education. Finally, one of the central points that the author wishes to stress is that teacher-based action research emerged in the U. K. as a dimension of school-based curriculum development initiated by teachers. He argues on the basis of personal experience that the action research movement was not something primarily transmitted from the higher education sector into the school system, even though teacher educators within higher education institutions have played a major role in facilitating action research and articulating its underlying logic. (Abstract accompanying article)

Mac Pherson, R. J. S. (1982, December). The W. A. peer process consultancy project: Action research as INSET for principals. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the New Zealand Association for Research in Education, Christchurch, New Zealand. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 229 836)

Five self-selected triads of Western Australia (W. A.) principals served as process consultants to improve their schools. Patterns of communication, leadership procedures, tensions impeding collaboration, decision-making, and problem-solving procedures were the foci of attention. The strategy asked each consultant pair (in turn) to clarify their values with regard to a real administrative issue in their peer's school; to construct a vision of a feasible alternative; and to generate change strategies and tactics before offering feedback and facilitative services. The consultation process occurred over a two-month

period followed by a day-long workshop. Most of the principals found the experience productive, and regretted its termination. Reports from each triad are summarized, and implications drawn later by the author are provided. A table illustrates responses to a survey of competencies and understandings consultants wanted as content for future workshops. (Abstract accompanying article)

Showers, B. (1985). Teachers coaching teachers. Educational Leadership,42(7), 43-49.

Smyth, J. (1984). Teachers as collaborative learners in clinical supervision: A state-of-the-art review. Journal of Education for Teaching,10(1), 24-38.

Taba, H., Noel, E., & Marsh, J. (1955). Action research as a technique of supervision. Educational Leadership,12(8), 453-458.

Winter, R. (1987). Problems in teacher appraisal--an action-research solution? Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the British Educational Research Association, Manchester, England. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 292 861)

Procedures and rationales for teacher appraisal are examined. The target-output model calls for agreed-upon objectives to be compared with professional work. The performance criteria model compares professional work to agreed criteria of competencies. A diagnostic model of appraisal of teacher needs and potentials is joined with the others in a "product" model that has more relevance for professional work as it views professional development in the process of teaching, in stimulating learning by the teacher. In approaching the problem of government appraisal of a profession, an "action-research" model is proposed to deal with enhancement of teachers' professionalism, leaving aspects of promotion and

response to incompetence to separate initiatives. (Winter, et al., p. 18.)

ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Argyris, C., & Schon, D. A. (1978). Organizational learning: A theory of action perspectives. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Press.

This book is particularly helpful in understanding the consistency or lack of consistency between one's espoused and practiced values. (Abstract accompanying article)

Roweton, W. E., & Wright, C. B. (1985). Teacher/researcher collaboration in an age of organizational development. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Education Research Association, Chicago, IL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 270 422)

Most agree, in general, that educational research benefits American schools. However, the specific relationship between research and application remain poorly cultivated, and too little educational research is actually utilized by classroom teachers. This paper selectively reviews the intricate association between educational researchers and American practitioners and focuses on models of professional collaboration. Educational research will be more generously applied if researchers, research institutions, teachers, and schools would realistically accommodate one another. A four-page list of references is included. (Abstract accompanying article)

CURRICULUM DELIBERATION

Connelly, M. (1978). How shall we publish case

studies in curriculum development? : An essay review of Reid and Walker's case studies in curriculum change. Curriculum Inquiry,8(1), 73-82.

McKernan, J. (1991). Action inquiry: Studied enactment. In E. C. Short (Ed.), Forms of curriculum inquiry (pp. 309-326). Buffalo, NY: State University of New York Press.

Roby, T. W. (1985). Habits impending deliberation. Journal of Curriculum Studies,17(1), 17-35.

The ingredients of this essay are straightforward: a short description of the deliberative format, a description of some habits which impede deliberation-especially in its curricular form-and some suggestions for their amelioration. (Author)

Reid, W. A. (1988, Fall). A research agenda: The institutional context of curriculum deliberation. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision,4(1), 3-16.

Willinsky, J. (1989). Getting personal and practical with personal practical knowledge. Curriculum Inquiry,19(3), 247-264.

Clandinin and Connelly's research on teacher's "personal practical knowledge" has made a substantial contribution to the study on teacher thinking. Yet as their research is currently constituted, its conception of teaching tends to isolate the teacher, as it fails to deal with the institutional elements to this form of work Two fundamental principals of this research project are reconsidered: one is the methodological as the researcher strives to collaborate with teachers, and the other is conceptual as the researcher pursues an individuality that lies at the center of "personal practical knowledge." A return to Clandinin and Connelly's data suggests that limiting factors in their collaborative efforts

include discourse conventions and the press for narrative unity. The principal challenge to their conception of the individual comes from the post-structuralist theories of the subject which would allow a more open, if less unified, experience in the teaching of school. (Abstract accompanying article)